

HX  
44  
.S76

\$1.00

There are  
**TRAITORS**  
to Socialism  
in Our Midst

By George Spiro

CONTENTS

Cynical Betrayal of Proletarian-Socialist Revolution in France —  
Subtle Bureaucratic Treachery in Czechoslovakia — Call  
for Amnesty for All Imprisoned Left Protesters  
Against Oppression — Sellout of Jewish  
and Arab Toilers — The Working  
Class and the Threat of  
World Hiroshima



70804-881

## A MESSAGE TO THE FOLLOWERS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY, OF THE SOCIALIST WORKERS PARTY, AND OF ALL OTHER LEFT ORGANIZATIONS

Dear Friends,

In May 1968 the smoldering discontent in the French universities and in the vast industrial fabric of France suddenly burst into a flame of anti-Capitalist action of such force and magnitude as to arouse grave concern, in fact, a thinly-veiled dismay and panic, among the exploiting elements in the world. Ten million French workers took possession of factories, shops, railroads, shipyards, utilities—of the entire basic economy of France. This was an insurrectionary act unprecedented in the highly developed Capitalist countries. Utterly fantastic was the fact that the movement was spontaneous. Neither the Communist Party, nor any other party or group operating within the working class, initiated this revolutionary act, or supplied vocal zeal to oust the Capitalists in the industrial field.

The French bourgeoisie and their Government, headed by the semi-dictator, General de Gaulle, lay paralyzed at the feet of the turbulent working class. By the law inherent in every revolutionary upsurge, the situation dictated a march forward, not backward. This law was highly readable in the May events. The next step following the seizure of economy should have been the formation of a workers' government, a task possible of achievement with a well organized party and correct political guidance.

The leaders of the organizations in the proletarian ranks came alive on the intensity of the situation, quickly recovering from astonishment. Conspicuously in the lead along the whole unbroken political and economic front was the Communist Party. It was viewed by millions of workers in France, and hundreds of millions outside the country, as a French copy of the Bolshevik Party of the 1917 period. There was no organization seriously challenging the supremacy of its influence.

Considerably less powerful were its Social Democratic rivals, often allies. On the Leftmost extremity of the political spectrum were insignificant Maoist groups, a few small Trotskyist organizations, and of lesser size and stature, the Anarchists. Except for the last-named, all profess adherence to the teachings of Karl Marx, with this difference among them: the Social Democrats reject the Bolshevik Revolution to be of a Marxist pattern and insist on reforming Capitalism into Socialism; those who claim to follow faithfully in the footsteps of the Bolsheviks of 1917 and call themselves "Marxist-Leninists," as does the Communist Party, the Maoists and the Trotskyites.

Many, if not the majority of the top "Marxist-Leninist" leaders knew that the factories seized by the working class belonged to it in its rights, just as under Feudalism the land tilled by the peasantry justifiably belonged to toilers of the land, not to the landlords. For centuries the French bourgeoisie was expropriating the major portion of the fruits of labor of its proletarian slaves. It has thus accumulated enormous wealth. And now, in May 1968, the great moment arrived foreshadowed by Marx in *Capital*: "The knell of Capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated."

The working class of France, as though a giant awakening from deep sleep, without even fully expanding its strength, deprived the Capitalist class of the ownership of industry. The bourgeois press the world over

misrepresented the seizure of factories, railroads and other branches of French economy by the ten million workers as a "general strike." It was nothing of the sort! In a general strike, as in the one which occurred in England in 1926, or in France in 1936, the Capitalists retain the possession of the industry struck. The workers, led by a union, or even in a "wild-cat strike" present economic demands to the Capitalists, followed by a settlement and assumption of work. In a strike, general or local, the workers walk *out* of the factories. In May 1968 in France the workers stayed *in* the factories, completely and absolutely disregarding the bourgeois law of ownership.

Significantly, the ten million French workers who reduced their former exploiters to the status of "displaced persons" never studied *Capital*. They crossed the threshold from the Capitalist into the Socialist form of economy without being conscious of the historical meaning of their action, and, it must be emphasized, without the guidance by the leaders of any organization within the working class, or among the students. It was an elemental fulfillment of historical advance in French society. This astonishing fact was noted by the Capitalist press: "The student movement, which started with a handful in Nantes, had no precise program, no central direction and no previously acknowledged leaders. The workers' movements were similarly spontaneous and popular. The strikers in Nantes who occupied the first factory acted on their own and are now looking back with amazement." (*The New York Times*, May 21, 1968, p. 17)

The leaders of the Communist Party of France could not have failed to grasp that their vast social resources, the tremendous growth of their Party in recent years, their impact on the mind of the workers and intellectuals, were incredibly far greater than in Lenin's case before and for sometime after the October Revolution. Lenin had to surmount immense obstacles before he secured the confidence of a majority of the Russian workers. A very large minority opposed him. Anti-Bolshevik sabotage of the railroad workers, of the telephone and telegraph workers, of the Post office and of other institutions, seriously hampered the defense of the October Revolution. Most of the peasants lined up behind the largest political party in Russia, the Socialist-Revolutionaries, abbreviated, SRs. There was a solid opposition to Lenin's line on the part of the entire Russian intelligentsia. Even Lenin's personal friend, a Left writer, Maxim Gorky, rejected the Bolshevik line to overthrow the Kerensky bourgeois regime. The students in a body firmly stood behind Kerensky. The majority of the working women outside Petrograd and other industrial centers identified themselves with the Mensheviks and other enemies of Bolshevism. The inconspicuous but socially and politically a very weighty mass of the peasant women did not exactly welcome the Bolshevik agitators in the villages. To add to Lenin's disadvantage, handicaps and gaping pitfalls, the Russian economy had been disorganized by the clumsy Tsarist authorities, the threat of intervention by the German and the Allied armies was not far off, the half-starved Russian proletariat had to climb alone the mountain of hardships, with no help from the world working class, which in 1917 was still tied to the two warring imperialist camps by Social Democracy.

In the 1968 France, in contrast to Russia of 1917, a more favorable disposition of classes for the overthrow of the Capitalist system one could not even invent. Whereas the Lenin Government left the economy of Russia in the hands of the Capitalists and landlords for many months

after the formation of the Bolshevik power, in the May 1968 France the transfer of the economy to the proletariat, with no "Bolshevik" power to guide this stupendous operation, was accomplished in a few short days.

The population of the universities in May 1968 France, unlike in Russia in 1917, extended a warm hand to the friendly working class and, with revolution against Capitalism in mind, was set to effect the overthrow of the de Gaulle Government, now a miserable toothless watchdog of the bourgeoisie. The ten million workers who took over the economy constituted two thirds of the working class of France, but the minority, unlike in Russia during the October Revolution, was also swept into the anti-Capitalist maelstrom.

The women of France, even the working women, have been pictured by bourgeois opinion as a conservative element. This to a degree is accurate for the reactionary aftermath of the May 1968 revolutionary crisis. In the elections in June the women were for stabilization of Capitalism—but not during the May days, the days of the expropriation of bourgeois economy. In May they enthusiastically immersed in the rising tide; they supplied food to the workers in the factories; they marched in millions, intensely involved in the aim the masses and the students set for themselves, the overthrow of General de Gaulle.

The women of France, as of other exploitative States, are within the identical class divisions as men. At certain moments in history they undergo radical transformations. When society is on a revolutionary course, the working women are the fiercest, determined participants in the upheaval. Of all the national divisions of the women, the intellectual and the working women of France stand the highest on the list of trailblazers for the emancipation of the female from the oppression by the "lover" sex. She is often the battering ram to break down the citadels of reaction. Let us recall certain, often forgotten or barely mentioned aspects of the history of advanced women of France. Among the glorious memories of the French Revolution is the famous history-making march of the working women of Paris to Versailles to arrest the King. And later the Liberal world was stirred by the astonishing formation of revolutionary women's clubs in Paris, which sought to turn the visionary concept of sex equality into a concrete achievement. And who is not deeply moved, reading the annals, by the scene of commotion, disbelief and male-chauvinist indignation in the Jacobin-controlled Convention when a revolutionary woman of undaunted spirit, Olympia de Gauges, walked grimly to the rostrum, and, supplementing the previously adopted Declaration of the Rights of Man, submitted the Declaration of the Rights of Women! And who, among sincere fighters against oppression and injustice is not shocked and revolted upon learning of the reaction of the petty bourgeois dictator, Robespierre, ordering to have her guillotined, and the clubs of the revolutionary women closed. And which of the bourgeois historians will deny the heroic part the valiant working women of Paris played in the defense of the Commune of 1871!

No, the women of France, and I may point out, the women of all countries, are not inherently conservative. By their social position in relation to the male sex, just as the working class by its slave status, the women are intrinsically revolutionary. This, of course, is a far-sighted view. Always sensing that they are the oppressed sex, not only of the working class but also of the bourgeoisie, they long for equality with men in their particular class division of society. In a revolutionary sit-

ation the toiling women at times are more terrifying to the tyrants than men. Under conditions of consolidation of the power of the oppressors, the same women often in bitter disappointment and loss of faith in the revolution, back the triumphant reaction.

A victorious authentic Socialist revolution in France or in any other country, would reject and repudiate the traditional male-dominated aspects of government. It would have issued a call for electing an equal number of representatives of both sexes to form an administrative mechanism for conducting the affairs of society, thereby closing forever the period of evolution stamped with the supremacy of the male sex.

In the May 1968 France, a true Party of the emancipation of the proletariat would appeal to the working women separately from the masses as a whole, calling the attention of the world to the oppression of the female in the economic and marriage spheres, voicing a scathing denunciation of the shameless indifference of the Capitalist regimes to the preying in their domains upon the proletarian girl by sex merchants, affecting millions of homes of the working class in America and elsewhere. The ban on the woman's right to equality in all avenues of public life would be lifted.

Would the working class female approve of such policy? The answer is obvious.

As to the farmer female population, which, unquestionably, is politically backward when compared with the working women, a truly Socialist regime would deal with the problem in a revolutionary manner. It would have issued an appeal to the women-toilers of the land:

The Socialist Government is liberating you and your families from usurers and speculators who have been robbing you and your families for centuries. All mortgages on farms are cancelled. Rents are abolished. The Socialist Government will arrange an organized exchange of industrial wares for the products of the farm. But above all, you are liberated from the domination of the male and are to participate in the administration in equal numbers and on equal terms with men. All anti-female prejudices are to be mercilessly combatted. The rural areas will cease to be a hunting ground of dealers in sex to seduce your daughters for prostitution houses in Paris and in other formerly glamorous centers of bourgeois dissipation. No one in any way will exploit the female.

Would the farmer female population support such a government? The answer is obvious.

But let me return from this digression to the subject under investigation.

When the student rebellion broke out, de Gaulle, without a moment's hesitation, brought into the arena of the upheaval his police in a brutal attempt to cow the rebels into submission to the university authorities. He was soundly defeated. The workers followed the path of the students, the country was swept by the factory-occupation movement, and de Gaulle soberly realized that were he to make police brutality again front-page news, he would have faced the danger of immediate physical eviction from office. An American bourgeois magazine later recalled: "the vicious club swinging by the Paris police in one night won the students the sympathy of the entire nation." (*Life*, May 31, 1968)

When society is charged with revolutionary electricity, nothing convulses the working class and the intellectual elements with a feeling of outrage and bitter resentment than a brutal assault by the armed forces

of the State upon those protesting injustice and oppression. Thus it was when in January 1905 a mass of working class families with ikons and pictures of the Tsar, approached his palace in St. Petersburg pleading for relief from poverty and abuse of power by his officials. They were met with a hail of bullets (The Bloody Sunday). His entire Empire shook with horror, and the roaring tempest of proletarian and peasant upheaval of 1905-6 was unleashed.

Oddly enough, in the May 1968 France, after de Gaulle's first attack upon the barricades of the students, which ended in his defeat, the police assumed an impartial pose in the face of the occupation of the factories by the workers and of the universities by the students. A capitalist news agency, UPI, on May 24, reported: "Critical too were the police, an unhappy lot. Their unions warned the Government yesterday not to systematically run the police against 'workers fighting for their demands.'"

This, essentially anti-Gaullist, decision was an extremely valuable contribution to a fresh evaluation by the Capitalists of the unreliability of their police during a giant upheaval of the working class.

Two days before, the Capitalist press had indicated that de Gaulle now feared the very thought of using the police. "The Government has refrained from the police repression that boomeranged so badly when attempted against student rebels last week." (*New York Times*, Editorial, "Challenge to de Gaulle," May 22, 1968)

But what about the Army? Could de Gaulle and his generals, swiftly shifting their tactic of restraint, order the soldiers to storm the factories and universities? This was a question asked by people with a superficial understanding of social phenomena. The Capitalist Army is an entity which, socially and ideologically, is far from being completely divorced from the civilian population. The soldiers are recruited from the toiling masses, the officers from the bourgeoisie. Each specific political situation in the country is reflected in the mood of the Army. That is why when a country is in a swirling tide of action by the revolutionary masses, their voice makes itself heard in the Army.

The soldiers, in their majority, feel keen concern for their relatives and friends they left behind in civilian life. Quite frequently, during an upsurge, personal and class ideological impacts overbalance the barracks discipline. At such moments an order by the generals to move against the masses usually brings on a catastrophe for the ruling exploiters. The most outstanding example in recent history occurred on the eve of the fall of the Tsar. On March 8, 1917, the working girls of the textile industry in Petrograd, cruelly oppressed and half-starved, marched in a street demonstration demanding bread and peace. The drunken generals ordered their troops to fire. The soldiers refused. This insubordination opened the floodgates of the upheaval which, in a few months, led to the overthrow of Capitalism in Russia.

Could de Gaulle order the Army to attack ten million Socialist-minded workers of France?

Of all the armies in the world, the French was the least reliable for the purpose of shedding the blood of the toiling masses of France. The "Marxist-Leninist" scholars knew this well, for Engels, as far back as nearly three-quarters of a century ago, stated, and quite correctly, "In France . . . the government is by no means sure of the army." (Introduction to the *Class Struggles in France* by Karl Marx)

If the French bourgeoisie, weighing the anti-imperialist temper of

its soldiers, did not dare to use the regular army in Vietnam and Algeria, and was compelled to rely on the volunteers of the Foreign Legion, how could its government, now submerged by the industrial occupation tide, take a calamitous chance of bringing the army upon the stage of the upsurge and thus, surely, release a shattering revolutionary force! Despite some talk about de Gaulle's consultation with his generals stationed in Germany regarding the advisability of using the Army, he manifested eminent caution, and dismissed the idea. The bourgeoisie did not deceive itself. Its hope lay exclusively in the proletarian camp, in the hands of traitors to Socialism, masked as liberators of the working class.

The struggle for emancipation of any social group ground under the heel of exploiters must begin by clearly defining the method of exploitation to which the given group is subjected. Do the leaders of the Communist Party know precisely that the method of bourgeois enslavement of the worker, visible to a revolutionist, pictured as a condition of freedom by the capitalists, is the *hiring system of servitude*? Marx termed the procedure "the wages system." One of the tragedies of the workers is that "society"—a pseudonym for bourgeois public opinion—accepts this condition of servitude as a matter of course. One would think that people who proclaim their ideal the liberation of the proletariat, leaders of a movement which affects an air of attachment to Marx's views, would work hard to cast a revealing light upon the "wage system of slavery." Yet, when one scans the pages of the publications of the Communist Party of France, or of Communist Parties of other countries, one fails to find a single article focusing the workers' attention on the precise social relationship by means of which the exploiters hold the workers in the coils of enslavement.

The largest and most powerful trade union organization in France has been for many years the General Confederation of Labor (CGT). It is headed by officials who simultaneously hold high posts in the Communist Party. Its vigorous anti-capitalist rhetoric has awakened a sensitive response in millions of workers and in tens of thousands of Left intellectuals in France.

It would seem, the workers led by this organization were the logical force to carry out the task which Marx enunciated over a century ago, "of using their organized forces as a lever for the final emancipation of the working class, that is to say, the ultimate abolition of the wage system." (*Value, Price and Profit*)

While Marx lived, the German Social Democrats, in their program adopted at Gotha, dwelt on the theme "Abolition of the wage system."

But the "Marxist-Leninist" Communist Party of France, as all the other "Marxist-Leninist" organizations throughout the world, just as the Socialist Parties of the post-1914-18 vintage, relegated this position, which Marx and most Nineteenth Century Socialists underlined as the guiding principle for emancipation of the working class, to virtual oblivion. Even in the numerous schools and libraries of the Communist Party where the works of Marx have been given wide publicity and circulation, the idea has always been kept in the mystic background.

The students were of tremendous weight in the May 1968 upsurge. Conspicuously inspired and eloquent they stood on the Left extremity of the spectrum of the events. They were the first to rise against de Gaulle, and the last of the defenders of the occupation movement. They were worthy companions of the ten million workers who in physical reality,

terminated the ownership and control of the bourgeoisie over the entire basic economy of France.

The student rebellion in France was not confined to that country, nor was it a new phenomenon in the highest institutions of learning in an exploitative society. Students rebelled before, and very frequently against the established law and order. A crisis in an exploitative society produces automatically a marked shift in the mental activity of the students, as well as of professors, from routine studies to the concrete investigation of the evil-smelling swamp of widespread corruption, crime, injustice and oppression reigning outside the campus. In the past few years the whole world was being shaken by significant outbreaks of student discontent. The reason is not far to seek. The world today is in the throes of the deepest crisis in history. Socially this is no time for relaxation. For, above all the old tensions—economic, racial, national, class, sex, parents-children, personal, and a thousand others, there is, since Hiroshima the tension of the problem of survival of the species. The world is extremely restless, agitated, almost mentally deranged as it sinks deeper and deeper into the immense quagmire of militarism. The university is in touch with the times. The university is a manufacturing plant of intellectual leadership. It is a plant founded by the exploiters centuries ago to produce, for their purposes, the future political leaders, scientists, poets and writers and the rest of the high level professions which constitute the pyramidal formation resting on the shoulders of the toiling masses.

However, the university is a unique place, not entirely safe for the exploiters. It produces also "illegal" thinkers, rebels and revolutionists opposed to the prevailing exploitative social order. The thinkers that opened the path of the French Revolution, Russo, Voltaire, the active leaders, Danton, Marat, Robespierre, and the active leaders of the working class, Marx, Engels, Lassalle, Bakunin, Plekhanov, Jaurés, Kautsky, Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin—all hailed from the bourgeois institution of learning. The upper strata of all the present-day Internationals consist primarily of former students.

It was the students in May 1968 France who initiated the expropriation of the bourgeoisie. The leaders of the Communist Party the moment they emerged from the background, denounced the rebel students. The world Capitalist press readily perceived the invaluable service the leaders of the Communist Party, standing at the head of the CGT, rendered to the powerless de Gaulle Government and the bourgeoisie of France. *The New York Times Magazine* of June 16, 1968 recorded this fact, giving a bourgeois twist, cool in tone, as an "explanation" for the astonishing and very mysterious policy, under the circumstances, of the Communist leadership of the CGT: "In the current strife, the C.G.T. vetoed fraternization with the students, fearing contamination by the *enrages* (madman—G.S.). Its policy was clearly to maintain the regime, in the hope that it would give in to some of the workers' demands."

The anti-Gaullist students were thus attacked not only from the bourgeois but also from the proletarian camp. "The Communists, like the Gaullists, have steadily denounced the student groups that started the crisis." (*N.Y.T. Magazine*, June 23, 1968)

The Communist Party said that the students were on an ultra-Leftist tangent when they voiced the demand to remove de Gaulle through revolutionary action. Leftism, indeed, is a serious danger to the workers.

Certain members of the Bolshevik Party carried in a demonstration

a sign calling for the revolutionary overthrow of the Capitalist Provisional Government at the time when that Government enjoyed overwhelming confidence and support of the masses. Was such the case with the French students? Emphatically no! General de Gaulle was the most hated figure in France. Ten million workers and millions of farmers shared the sentiments of the students. Had the students made an attempt without definite support of the entire working class, to remove de Gaulle, that could be classified, correctly, as a Leftist tactic. Had the students broken out into looting the fashionable shops and department stores, seizing radios, and other merchandise, setting houses on fire, as some of the utterly irresponsible, politically ignorant black activists do in the United States, they would have been guilty of a heinous ultra-Leftist crime against the unfolding revolutionary position. The onset of the great May 1968 social crisis demanded, in the interest of Socialism, that the de Gaulle regime, now a mere symbol of the political power of the powerless bourgeoisie, as the Bastille was in July 1789 a mere symbol of powerless Feudalism in France, be removed by direct mass action.

Because the political upbringing of all the millions of the advanced workers of France was for decades in the hands of the Communist Party, the emphatic discredit, ridicule and rejection of unity of workers and students set a process of sharp recoil by most workers from contact with the student forces. Ironically, the antipathy of the Communist workers toward the students rebelling against the bourgeoisie was conducted on the basis that the students themselves were *bourgeois!* But so had been Marx and Engels!

Forbidden access to state power by their leadership through a crude maneuver to end the crisis by means of a wage settlement with de Gaulle, and on that basis relinquish the industry to the bourgeoisie, the workers, still supported by the rebel students, momentarily took the stand against both, the bourgeoisie, as their class enemy, and against their misleaders. *The New York Times* presented the picture in the following words: "Any estimate of the general's chances must start with the unprecedented character of the opposition he now faces. His opponents are rank-and-file of the country's workers, as well as students and peasants. Communist, Catholic and Socialist union leaders have seen their settlement with management, negotiated by Premier Pompidou, rejected at the plant level. President de Gaulle's effort now to paint the strikes as a Communist conspiracy bears little relationship to the facts. The general's present tactics are designed to cover his defeat at the hands of the workers. His projected referendum, which was to ratify the labor settlement and provide him with a national vote of confidence, became a risky enterprise once the wage agreement had been blocked. A straight ye-or-no vote could come out 'Non' in the present atmosphere. A Parliamentary election offers possibilities of compromise." (*Editorial, N.Y. Times*, May 31, 1968)

What sort of a "compromise" could there be between the people who in the real circumstances were no longer true Capitalists and the people who no longer were actually their slaves, now the factual owners of industry? Either the workers would consummate the throwing off of the former exploiters by establishing a Socialist Government, or the factories would be returned to the dispossessed Capitalists, and the workers would resume production on the Capitalist basis, and moreover, in real wages for less than before May, due to the steady rise of prices of necessities caused by the inflationary trend of the franc.

But why this apparently incongruous fact that the leadership of the Communist Party, which had more to do with the defeat of the workers than the bourgeoisie itself, persistently, consistently, and adamantly refrained from attempting to seize power? As compared with the absolute strength of the Bolshevik Party in 1917 (240,000) in a population four times vaster than the French in 1968, the Communist Party of France numerically (450,000) was almost twice as large, while in relation to the size of the population, this Party was infinitely more weighty.

The French Communist Party over the years won administrative control of many towns and villages. The capital of France has been ringed with a chain of industrial communities known as the "Red belt of Paris." But nowhere was there the relative calm of provincial smugness and softness of spirit "against" de Gaulle's regime more pronounced than in the "Red" little centers of bourgeois respectability. In the 1917 Russia the hottest flame against Kerensky was burning among the sailors in Kronstadt and next among the leaders of the Bolshevik Party, Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin and the rest; in the May 1968 France, the center of anti-de Gaulle revolutionary fire was the Sorbonne, in a certain sense a perfect embodiment of the 1917 Baltic Fleet. The leaders of the French Communist Party, Rochet, Seguy, Duclos, and others, were the fire extinguishers.

The goal to suppress the workers pursued by the leading cadres of the Communist Party in the May 1968 France was too obvious for the perspicacious observers to miss. An American Capitalist periodical even imagined that the central governing body of the Communist Party, born and raised as a political force to direct the overthrow of the Capitalist State, became a component part of that bourgeois mechanism: "The spectre of a red menace was somewhat less hair-raising to those Frenchmen who, in three weeks of near-revolution, were witness to the ineffectuality of the French Communist Party. This in spite of its considerable size: the party normally gets the support of nearly a fourth of French voters. The country's largest union, the Communist-led C.G.T., has become such a member of the Establishment that days passed before its leaders realized what the workers were striking about. The union had to run to get in front of the men it is supposed to lead—and did so in the hopes of restraining them." (*Life*, June 14, 1968, Editorial)

The "ineffectuality" of that Party proved very effective, from the position of the guidance it assumed to keep the workers of France within the bounds of Capitalism.

The question before us, however, is, why did this tower of popularity and strength, the Communist Party of France, reject the unprecedented chance to overthrow Capitalism in that country?

Could it be that the hard-core group of leaders of the Communist Party feared intervention by the outside Capitalists, particularly by the greatest power in all the world, in all history, the military-naval might of the Washington imperialists? The very supposition is preposterous. American intervention would have been a mad undertaking. France is not Korea, not Vietnam, not the economically half-starved Bolshevik Russia of 1917-1919, within easy reach of all imperialist powers. The Capitalist intervention in Bolshevik Russia is a spellbinding story of mutiny of the soldiers, including the American ones under General Graves. A major war such as against "Red France" would have brought on a catastrophe in the United States itself.

No, the leaders of the Communist Party of France understood they had absolutely nothing to fear from the bourgeoisie, either their own or foreign. Why then did they resist with all their political skill the popular demand to oust de Gaulle by direct "Bolshevik" action of the revolutionary workers and students? What danger they discerned to themselves which, they evidently were convinced, could not be counteracted by them? The answer is, the leaders of the Communist Party, just as the leaders of their allies, the Socialists, and the men heading the trade unions, are *bureaucrats*. And as such, they had good reason to think, as did even many bourgeois analysts of the situation, and quite correctly, that the mighty impact of a sudden change in the position of the classes, with the actual power assumed by the ten million workers and tens of thousands of students, sweeping France as a turbulent revolutionary avalanche, no bureaucratic setup could survive. On the other hand, with the Capitalist power restored, they calculated, they could safely continue in business.

To the reactionaries in France the game the Communist Party leaders were playing was as clear as a sparkling moon: "Even the Gaullist *Paris-Presse* has reported that Government leaders during the crisis had 'blessed the Communist Party every day.'" (N.Y.T., May 31, 1968)

The inactivity of ten million workers in the factories could not continue indefinitely. No society can live by idleness. Either the wheels of industry would be started by *free* toilers for the benefit of the working masses themselves, with many Socialist-minded engineers and managers joining the young, aggressive and enthusiastic development, or the workers would surrender the industry they held, and themselves, to the dislodged Capitalists. Pursuing the latter alternative, the leaders of the Communist Party centered their energies upon inducing the workers to accept an agreement with the de Gaulle set whereby the Capitalists would pay a "substantial" increase in wages, and thereby, as a matter of course, would secure the return of industry. To the great honor of the workers, they indignantly rejected the monetary bribe in exchange for their industry and their freedom. "Both Communist and non-Communist union leaders were evidently surprised when the workers last Monday rejected the largest wage package offered them since the general strike of 1936." (N.Y.T., May 31, 1968)

The aging servant of the bourgeoisie, operating by the sanction of the leaders of the Communist Party, meeting assorted failures on all counts, looked about for a device to restore his power. He probably recalled the plebiscite trick used by Louis Napoleon. Pretending to leave the solution of the crisis "to the nation" de Gaulle generously introduced the idea of holding a referendum, promising to remove himself if the decision went against him. But upon reflection, he withdrew the proposal. A referendum would be too risky. A simple count of "yes" and "no" put a severe limitation on parliamentary deals and intricate political chicanery behind the scenes, leaving very limited room for conspiracy of any kind. He could have been cast out of office even by a small margin of negative votes. Perceiving the risk, de Gaulle, well shielded against a revolutionary overthrow by the leaders of the Communist Party, took the course upon the beaten track of parliamentary manipulations. He dissolved the National Assembly and ordered new elections, made a deal with the extreme Rightist forces by releasing from prison his adversaries of the Algerian crisis, aroused the neutralists, and confidently rested, having no doubt of the success of the maneuver.

The leaders of the Communist Party, outstripping de Gaulle in promoting parliamentary delusions, heartily endorsed his attempt to shift the entire crisis into the calm channel where the spirit of the greatest social upheaval in modern France would be extinguished.

It is apropos to recall Lenin's situation a few days before the October Revolution. There was no powerful "Socialist" world stretching over half of Europe and over half of Asia with a billion population. In very difficult circumstances, to his mind very propitious for proletarian revolution in Russia, Lenin stressed the importance of immediate, direct, revolutionary action, rejecting to wait not merely for the convocation of the Constituent Assembly, a bourgeois institution, but for the Second Congress of Soviets where, it was already plain, the Bolsheviks would secure a majority. "We must not wait for the All-Russian Congress of Soviets," he wrote on October 21, 1917. "History will not forgive revolutionaries for procrastinating when they can be victorious today (will certainly be victorious today) . . . and it would be an infinite *crime* on the part of the revolutionaries were they to let the moment pass" he wrote on November 6, one day before the October Revolution. When he said "history" he undoubtedly meant the toiling masses. "I exhort my comrades with all my heart and strength to realize that everything now hangs on a thread; that we are being confronted by problems that can be solved not by conferences or congresses (even Congress of Soviets), but exclusively by the people, by the struggle of the armed masses."

Lenin, of course, spoke to authentic revolutionaries, for they had not yet become State bureaucrats. Yet his view of their integrity hinged on the single crucial moment of decision: "There is not the slightest doubt that if the Bolsheviks allowed themselves to be caught in the trap of constitutional illusions—'faith' in the Congress of Soviets and in the convocation of the Constituent Assembly, 'waiting' for the Congress of Soviets, and so forth—they would be *miserable traitors* to the proletarian cause." (*The Crisis Has Matured*)

Did the leaders of the Communist Party of France fail in their duty to the toiling masses? They had no such duty, because, unlike the Bolsheviks of 1917, the leaders of the French proletariat are conscious traitors inside the workers' camp.

When the ten million workers—but not the students—accepted the "logic" of restoring de Gaulle's Government and the French bourgeoisie to political solidity by staking their actual mastery of France against the bankrupt exploiters on the parliamentary gambling table, the treason was brought to consummation.

But first, the leaders of the Communist Party had to dislodge the French proletariat from its stronghold, the expropriated economy. So, on the last day of May, they performed an audacious tight-rope feat: "The Communist-led General Confederation of Labor, which controls most of the ten million strikers, this morning started a difficult operation—that of dismantling the countrywide strike movement without losing control over the rank and file." (New York Times, June 1, 1968)

The leaders of the Communist Party of France, unquestionably, realized that power was theirs for the taking. However, unlike the millions of their proletarian followers, who never read a line of the history of the numerous inside-the-Bolshevik-Party-oppositions to the policies of the Lenin-Trotsky regime, and unlike Daniel Cohn-Bendit, who had much to learn before taking upon himself the role of revolutionary guide in the

political jungle without a theoretical map and a tactical compass, the few hundred top leaders of the Communist Party of France were well-read men. Perhaps not in all the important details, they knew that when the Bolshevik leaders took power they adopted a bureaucratic-dictatorial line not only in relation to the bourgeoisie and its supporting parties, but also in relation to the working class, and even to the Party membership and the lower functionaries of the "Soviet" State. In the Bolshevik Party, as examination of records shows, opposition arose against certain policies of the Lenin-Trotsky regime, rejecting the peace negotiations with the Kaiser, and in favor of carrying out the 1917 pledge of no negotiations with his Government. A strong opinion for a while prevailed disagreeing with the leaders' move of transferring the seat of the "Soviet" government from Petrograd, the cradle of the Bolshevik Revolution, to Moscow. In 1918, 1919, 1920 and 1921 numerous opposition groups sprang up like mushrooms. The most outstanding of them were the Left Communists (Bukharin), Democratic Centralists (Sapronov) denouncing the bureaucratic cluttering of the administrative apparatus, and the Workers Opposition, the most determined anti-bureaucratic tendency, laying the responsibility for bureaucratism at the door of the Central Committee of the Party. Led by Kollontai and Shliapnikov, the Workers Opposition found support among nearly 60,000 Bolshevik workers.

And even after the prohibition of factions by the Tenth Party Congress (1921) the mood against the policy of appointments, against the placing by Trotsky of former Tsarist officers in the Red Army, against the dictatorship of officials, prevailed. The early period of Stalin's regime was marked with political strikes (1923), with the formation of Trotskyist Left Opposition embracing, in the beginning, half of the Party membership.

The handsomely bound volumes of the Stalinist history of the Bolshevik Party shut the door to the exploration of the causes that produced the oppositions and made sufficiently clear to all Stalinist bureaucrats at home and abroad to be on the alert against the rank-and-file yearning for democratic procedure. The few hundred top leaders of the Communist Party of France, being in mind potential high State officials, industrial and "educational" dictators, familiar with the turbulent chapters in the life of the incipient "Soviet" bureaucracy, could not venture, as I indicated before, to take the risk with the ten million workers and with the whole student body of France who acted independently of the Communist Party in the direction of removing the Capitalists from power. "The French Communists were apparently caught as far off guard by the student and worker protest movement as were the other established parties. To the leftist students, the Communists were 'Stalinist creeps.'" (N.Y.T., May 21, 1968)

\* \* \*

May 1968 France generates new thought on the views of securing a painless release of the working class from the status of being a hired slave element. For decades, especially in England, the possibility, even probability of a peaceful Socialist revolution was commonly accepted by the advanced workers, with the understanding to mean achievement of victory over the Capitalists in the parliamentary arena. Theoretically such victory cannot be excluded, but thus far only theoretically. History has not yet proved or disproved the possibility of parliamentary road to

the overthrow of Capitalism. Is there a certainty that the Capitalists, losing hold over the masses in election, would peacefully submit to the expropriation and, in a rage, would not attempt by force to reestablish their position as masters of society? Marx warned that, while the Socialist revolution could be carried out in England peacefully, the Capitalists might resort to a "pro-slavery rebellion."

But in May 1968 France, without a civil war, without a period of heated disputes and outbursts of bloody violence, without elections either to a bourgeois parliament or to workers' councils (1917 Soviets), and most important of all, without any danger of mobilization of a "pro-slavery rebellion" inside or outside France, the working class by one swift, physically painless to all classes operation, turned history in the direction of achieving freedom from "wage slavery."

The lesson of this dramatic turn must be thoroughly studied. It would seem, we have witnessed a significant innovation in the struggle of the workers for emancipation from hiring servitude. It seems, History says to the workers: When you begin the Socialist Revolution, the first step, do not attempt by means of a general *strike* or direct insurrection to dislodge the Capitalists. At such juncture forget about strikes against the Capitalists and about insurrections. Start with the occupation where you are. Take the industry. Take the banks. The greater the range of expropriations of the Capitalists the weaker they will be. Lay stress on taking over the bread, dairy, meat, fish and the canned supplies. The Capitalists will be overnight wiped out as a class. Their State will cease to function. The next step, elect representatives to a workers' government based on the fundamental principles of abolition of hiring servitude and establishment of male-female social equality. There are numerous bourgeois intellectuals, industrial engineers, managers, who are anti-Capitalist idealists. They will gladly join in the work of constructing Socialist society. By taking over all economy from the Capitalist class, especially the means of feeding its Army and itself, and offering it an honest, non-exploitative way of earning a living under the aegis not of personal tyranny of a "Marxist-Leninist" dictator, but under a just, humane cooperative guidance, you will prevent the opening of the floodgates of a civil war.

The lessons of the peaceful innovation first demonstrated in the May 1968 France was not missed by Capitalist observers. They could not help expressing amazement at a unique phenomenon. Whereas in Russia the process of "we are robbing the robbers" (Lenin), carried out not in a hurry, was accompanied with tens of thousands of Capitalists and millions of workers and peasants butchered, in the May 1968 France the "robbing of the robbers" went off without a single Capitalist killed, without a single worker killed or put in prison! "The relative absence of violence despite a mass upheaval that took most of the country's students and workers out on strike has been one of the extraordinary characteristics of the recent troubles." (N.Y.T., June 15, 1968)

It must be acknowledged, however, that in certain factories vicious Gaullist managers were placed by the workers under temporary plant arrest. "The Communist leaders worked hard to persuade members to avoid 'provocations.' They won the release of imprisoned plant managers. . ." (N.Y.T., May 31, 1968)

History warns the workers: your chief task is to free yourselves from the status of hired labor, and form a giant cooperative of free

producers. In establishing your State, keep clear of numerous traps on your way. Beware of the principles of hiring the functionaries of the workers' State. Engels erroneously imagined that hiring the officials at workers' pay would "safeguard the workers against their own officials." This was false reasoning, as the experience of the Bolshevik State clearly brought out. In practice this principle transforms you from being hired slaves of the Capitalists into hired slaves of your "own" managers of plants, bureaucratic railroad executives, heads of all the institutions of the State, but above all, into ideological and physical prisoners of a single individual-dictator, the General Secretary of the Communist Party. Beware also of the nebulous formula "abolition of exploitation of man by man." It says nothing concrete about your status. Remember always, and burn this truth into your mind: the key formula to your emancipation is *abolition of hiring human beings*, not the abstract "abolition of exploitation of man by man."

Apropos of this misleading slogan, an amusing little story was heard by a *New York Times* correspondent in "Socialist" Yugoslavia. It was told him by a publisher. "There was," he said, "this comrade who said to another: 'Comrade, tell me what is the difference between capitalism and communism?' And the comrade replied: 'Comrade, under capitalism you have the exploitation of man by man. Under communism it is just the reverse.' (*N.Y.T. Magazine*, Dec. 8, 1968, p. 144)

The witty anecdote is filled with irony, and should be drastically revised, to read differently. Under Capitalism the exploitation is carried out by private owners of economy; under "Communism," by the men in control of the State economy. The exploited in both systems are chiefly workers. The method of exploitation used in both systems is *hiring*, an enslaving condition, masked with pompous, masterful, deliberate, and made highly believable lies, under Capitalism that the workers are free people; and under "Socialism" that they are the *owners* of State economy.

June, 1968, as compared with May, was a relaxing month for the traitors in the proletarian camp and for the Capitalists. It was the month when the leaders of the Communist Party, in unison with the Socialist and the Catholic trade union bureaucrats, guided the workers back to their status of being hired slaves of the French bourgeoisie and the setting of the stage for extinguishing the crisis through parliamentary elections.

In parliamentary elections the bourgeoisie always pretends, as it does in all other social fields, that it offers the workers, the farmers, the small shopkeepers and professional classes, to all parties in opposition to the regime of big manufacturers and bankers, a fair and equal chance at the ballot box. The leaders of the Communist Party can elucidate with staggering evidence the hypocrisy of the upper crust of the Capitalist class exercised in parliamentary elections. There is enormous political effectiveness in the sheer weight of money spent in the election campaign. The Capitalist State is in decisive control of the electoral machinery, the task of counting the cast ballots is performed by government officials, most of whom are loyal to the Capitalists.

If de Gaulle was unable to control the anti-Capitalist upheaval in the economy, he enjoyed a large measure of supervision over the parliamentary machinery. The leaders of the Communist Party realized that. They were also aware that when it came to counting the participants in

the opposition action, the de Gaulle regime was an unconscionable liar. The whole world knew that. Thus: "When nearly a million students and workers paraded through the streets of Paris last week, the Government television network gave the figure as 200,000. Normally no one would have been shocked. The network has generally minimized opposition. But these are not normal times. There were so many protests that the network apologized and revised the figure to 800,000. The newscaster who gave the low first figure now says that he was forced to do so. When the strike movement spread to the network, he became one of the most vocal rebels." (*N.Y.T.* May 21, 1968)

Once committed to the decision to disrupt the revolutionary situation, and realizing that to leave the masses in the possession of industry would give them power-advantage at the polls, the "Communist" leaders on June 5, the day of the obvious stabbing the proletariat in the back, issued a call to the workers to end the "strike." Confusion and demoralization set in at once. From June 5 onward the great revolutionary tide was rapidly receding in chaos. Given political oxygen, the de Gaulle regime with remarkable rapidity recovered its repressive ability. A few hours after the traitors stabbed the proletariat in the back, precisely on June 6, at dawn, de Gaulle's specially-trained "riot" force, kept in abeyance, began the storming operations. The *New York Times* ten days later gave an almost photographic portrayal of that dark moment for the working class: "And so it was that on June 5 the C.G.T. asked the French workers to return to their jobs. In many areas, negotiations were interrupted. Management and Government negotiating teams stalled, seeing that the union was clearly more interested in a return to a normal situation where the elections could be prepared than in backing the workers' demands. A few industries, particularly the key automobile plants and the Sud-Aviation factories, continued to hold out. At the Flins Renault plant in the early morning hours of June 6, 1,000 riot troops forced their way in and ejected the occupied workers. The next day, riot police used their tear gas to break up a worker-student demonstration at the plant. The union stand seemed to have encouraged the Government to resort to strong-arm methods." (*N.Y.T. Magazine*, June 16, 1968)

In proportion to the rate of repossession of industry, the French bourgeoisie was recovering its high spirits. "The prematurely predicted 'second French Revolution' has not taken place." (*N.Y.T.*, June 15, 1968)

When a system of deception gets an iron grip on minds, no amount of warning, no documentary evidence can affect a turn toward truth in their train of thought. We may well recall the situation in Germany in 1930-32. The whole liberal world, the Jews in particular, were alarmed by the fantastic expansion of Hitler's influence while the Communist workers were drugged by Ulbrecht, Duclos, Browder and other flunkies of Stalin with the narcotic that Fascism was not the main danger in Germany. Stalin thus paralyzed the key force in German society capable of leading the masses against the Nazis and thereby against Capitalism.

Stalin's official organ of the Communist International, about three months before Fascism took over, told the workers: "It may seem that in Germany, at the present time, for example, the chief social bulwark of the bourgeoisie is Fascism, and that, therefore, we should deal the chief blows against Fascism. This is not correct." (*Communist International*, Oct. 15, 1932, p. 674)

The French masses in June 1968 were so tragically blind to the fact that they were victim of genuine collaboration between their leaders and the Capitalists that they succumbed to the fraudulent picturing of their abysmal defeat as a *victory*! On June 16, when over nine of the ten million workers had surrendered their hold on the economy and taken their old places at the machines and conveyer belts, the *Worker*, chief organ of the Communist Party of the United States, printed "victory" photographs just received from France. The legend read: "Paris subway workers (left) prepare to send the first train on its way from the Place de la Bastille Station after their three-week victorious strike." On June 23, more photographs of "victory" were displayed in the pages of the *Worker*: "At Ivry, striking transit workers stage a victory parade after ratifying a new contract. They march under the banner of the General Confederation of Labor (C.G.T.), the largest federation in France, headed by Communist Georges Segoy."

To the Communist workers the world over, the reason for the shocking collapse of the May upheaval has remained a dark mystery. The "optimistic" traitors, because of their seeming nobility of spirit and because their crime-laden history is known to lamentably few people, retained the confidence of their victims. And though these misleaders had been dispirited during the factory-occupation movement, when the attention was shifted to the parliamentary field, they plunged with extraordinary zeal into the campaign. The elections produced results not unexpected by de Gaulle. The leaders of the Communist Party and their Socialist allies lost very little of their voting strength, but due to the mechanics of the French electoral system, in an otherwise hopeless social situation for the Capitalist Government, the manipulation produced a smashing Gaullist victory.

"The Gaullist regime, which two months ago was on the brink of political disaster, thus has more political power than ever." (N.Y.T., July 7, 1968) And this, despite the fact that "the strike of radio and television staffs for objectivity in the news also hurt the Government and deprived the Gaullists of one of their chief campaign instruments." (Ibid. June 23, 1968) Appropriate to the victory of de Gaulle, not of the workers, the head of the Capitalist Government of France could have sung an American Western: "I'm back in the saddle again."

In every Capitalist or "Socialist" country, behind the impressive facade bearing the arresting-the-eye sign "The Communist Party" lies a history of policies of startling contents. The archives of each, and particularly the records of the Bolshevik Party, which is the father of them all, reveal the precise social and political origin of the leadership of these organizations. It must be borne in mind that the place of political genesis of every Communist Party in the world is not the country in which it was originally launched but Bolshevik Russia, just as, in a historical sense, the political root of every pre-1914 Socialist Party was Germany.

#### **The Historical Background of the Trotskyite Critics of the Communist Party of France**

Before 1917 Stalin was the most inconspicuous figure among the top leadership of the Russian Marxist movement. Lenin was outstanding, particularly after the outbreak of the 1914 War, when he stood virtually alone. Trotsky was the most spectacular. His star began to shine

brightly in the days of abortive Revolution of 1905 when he was chosen Chairman of the Soviet of Workers Deputies. He created a remarkably striking "Theory of Permanent Revolution," the idea that a backward nation could proceed with the Socialist Revolution, especially Tsarist Russia, before the advanced Capitalist countries, specifically Germany, France and England. No one and certainly not Marx, entertained such an "absurd" idea.

In 1917 Trotsky was Chairman of the Petrograd Soviet, the chief orator of the Bolshevik Party, organizer of the October Revolution; then, Commissar for Foreign Affairs, Organizer of the Red Army, chief strategist of victory over the White Guard forces, and co-founder with Lenin of the Communist International.

Today there is a worldwide movement bearing Trotsky's name. The Trotskyites seem to be the most carping critics of certain policies of the Communist Parties. To what particular historical juncture in Russia do they date the origin of the Trotsky tendency? Not to the pre-1917 history, because they hold that in the old Lenin-Trotsky polemic, Lenin was right, except for the Theory of Permanent Revolution.

The Trotskyite movement, a distinct post-October phenomenon in the Bolshevik Party, was born in the Autumn of 1923. The claim is made that while Lenin was a dying man, Trotsky in his stubborn revolutionary integrity, and inexhaustible reserves of courage and energy, championed the cause of workers' democracy, carrying on a combat against bureaucratic corruption of the regime, centering his uncompromising struggle upon the powerful General Secretary of the Party, Stalin, who represented the very focus of personal aggrandisement.

As we continue going over the dusty records of the beginning of the Stalin era we discover in the yellowing pages complete refutation of this story. Chapter by chapter, authentic documentary evidence plucks the stitches of this fictitious production loose, and the whole falls apart to reveal the very opposite. Again, we must bear in mind a certain axiom: confirmed distorters of history do not merely tell lies; they defend them as truths, often even to the death!

One of the documents we come upon which play an impressive part in revealing the lie is Lenin's letter to the Twelfth Party Congress proposing to remove Stalin from the key post of power. The authenticity of this letter dated December 1922-January 1923, eventually named *Lenin's Will*, was confirmed by Stalin himself in a speech published in *Pravda*, the chief organ of the Party (Nov. 2, 1927). What position did Trotsky take in the face of Lenin's line to liquidate Stalin and Stalinist corruption in the Party? In a conversation with Kamenev, as Trotsky incautiously recorded in his autobiography, he assured this partner of the topmost bureaucrat in the Bolshevik Party: "I am against liquidating Stalin. . . ."

The statement clearly implies that the dominant theme among the top Party leaders at the moment was Lenin's plan to oust Stalin. That Stalin was the center of bureaucratic personal extremism, was obvious to Lenin. Unquestionably, it was plain also to Trotsky.

The Twelfth Party Congress was held in April 1923. Lenin was completely incapacitated by illness. According to the archives, Trotsky was the most illustrious figure at the gathering. By affable agreement with Stalin, the "Will" was withheld from the Party membership. The two topmost leaders committed a dishonest act prompted by the understanding

to share power equally between them.

But the real wielder of control in the Party and the State, the chief custodian of the destiny of the entire political spectrum of "Soviet" society, was the General Secretary. His Gargantuan egoism and lust for greater and greater personal power propelled him to take advantage of his strategic post.

Trotsky in personal glamor and historical stature stood above Stalin. To discredit and to tarnish Trotsky's reputation, and, proportionately, to advance himself, step by step, in popularity and esteem of the "Soviet" society and the Communist International, was not too difficult to engineer for the master of intrigue, as Stalin proved to be—especially with Trotsky being opposed to his removal, and participating in the suppression of Lenin's Will.

Spring and Summer of 1923 passed in complete unanimity in the Central Committee headed by Stalin. In appearance, but not in fact, "collective leadership" was a durable arrangement. Suddenly, like a bolt out of the blue, Stalin and his two closest companions, Zinoviev and Kamenev, the "Troika," projected the charge that Trotsky threatened to supplant Leninism with "Trotskyism." The Party was called upon by them to meet Trotsky's challenge. The average Bolshevik worker, although almost a worshipper of Trotsky, found it difficult to disprove that there might be a grain of truth in this charge.

The reverberating accusation was accompanied with sharp and ever sharper hounding of Trotsky and with persecution of his defenders and supporters. At length, his closest friends got together, with him seemingly detached from their action, and formed a faction which they named "Left Opposition." Their sole, though undeclared, and actually concealed, purpose was to protect Trotsky and themselves from verbal, and later physical, assaults conducted by the Stalinists. Trotsky's political ammunition was theoretical arguments to prove that since 1917 his and Lenin's views were basically identical. The fact that the Stalin-Zinoviev-Kamenev charge was a malicious falsification was of course only too clear to Trotsky. But the fact that the whole noise about the danger of "Trotskyism" was a factional maneuver to pull him down had to be concealed by the leaders of both factions. Not only the top Stalinists were impelled to maintain silence about Lenin's "Will," but the Trotsky leaders too had to be tongue-tied regarding Trotsky's participation in the suppression of this historical document. Logically, therefore, the leadership of the Left Opposition, for fear of exposing Trotsky, refrained from raising the issue of carrying out Lenin's proposal to remove Stalin.

But Trotsky and his close collaborators, accepting the situation to live their lives as loyal oppositionists to the General Secretary, thus aiding Stalin to continue the disintegrating bureaucratic process in the Party and the State, were conditioned to go along in doing their utmost to prevent the leakage of truth. A glaring proof of this is to be found in the archives. In 1925, an American Left intellectual, Max Eastman, a strong sympathizer of the Lenin-Trotsky regime, a very ardent personal admirer of Trotsky, later becoming completely disgusted with him and turning to Fascism, visited his illustrious friend in Moscow. Trotsky, in confidence, let his affectionate visitor read a copy of Lenin's Will. Eastman kept it.

Upon returning to America, growing more and more indignant at

Stalin's hounding of Trotsky, Eastman decided to lend a hand to the Left Opposition. He got in touch with *The New York Times*, showed its editors Lenin's document, assuring them it was positively authentic. They realized at once that here was a piece of sensation that could rock the world with astonishment. The supposedly incorruptible revolutionists in Moscow were actually thieves of personal power. The *Times* published the document.

The incredible disclosure shocked the rank and file of the entire Communist International and put its leaders in a desperate situation. Was this story about Lenin's "Will" true? The Stalin cult had already been introduced, and was now under suspicion. If Lenin said Stalin should be removed, then why was he still the General Secretary of the Party? Was it possible that the man presented as "the best disciple of Lenin," "the most devoted Leninist," was actually a thief of power? Quite logically, many eyes turned inquiringly in the direction of the leader of the Left Opposition, still a respected member of the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party, member of the highest body of the Communist International.

Trotsky came out with a statement: "Comrade Lenin has not left any 'will.' . . . All talk with regard to a concealed or mutilated 'will' is nothing but a despicable lie." The statement was first published in Russia (*Bolshevik*, Sept. 1, 1925). It was immediately printed in the widely-circulated publication of the Communist International, *International Press Correspondence* (Sept. 3, 1925).

In his statement Trotsky took pride in Stalin's leadership and with pretended indignation declared that Eastman "characterizes the leading comrades of our Party in a manner which cannot be designated as anything but calumny."

In the three decades of Stalin's stolen power there were only two moments of agonizing uneasiness in his mind at the danger of losing the post of General Secretary. The first occurred at the end of 1922, when Lenin, aroused by Stalin's rudeness and enormous personal power (contents of the Will), made preparations to dismiss him, the second in 1925, caused by the Eastman exposure. In both instances Stalin was saved by Trotsky.

To follow up these closely interconnected facts with logical analysis, one can readily perceive that Trotsky played the key role in the rise of Stalinism. Unquestionably, having sustained Stalin, Trotsky doomed the half-million anti-Stalin workers in the USSR, assured the course of the world working class toward unparalleled succession of terrible disasters which culminated with the incredible stupidity on the part of Stalin in trusting Hitler, the destruction of thirty million lives of the Russian masses, of six million Jews, of ten million German workers. Thus, Trotsky already in 1922-3 was a monstrous deceiver of the working class. History establishes, in his as well as in Stalin's case, that a leader occupying a post of personal power becomes transformed into a leading deceiver of the toiling masses, and that from lying to the working class to betraying it to the Capitalists is but a short and easy step.

The fateful statement by Trotsky gave a spurt to Stalin's grip on the Communist International. The shift among the leaders of the Communist Parties was taking place toward unswerving allegiance to Stalin. Conversely, Stalin was making and unmaking the composition of the leader-

ship by casting upon the heap many of the most vociferous of his international lackeys, who damned one another in a fierce factional struggle for power in the organization. During these fights some of these adventurers were pushed out of power permanently. Such, for instance, was the experience of James P. Cannon in the Communist Party of the USA. Upon joining the Party he lined up with one or another clique, now with the Foster-Browder faction, then with the Lovestone-Wolfe-Gitlow faction, soon back into the Foster-Browder fold, and finally, completely thwarted in his personal prospects by Stalin, he looked about for possibilities outside the Party. By that time Trotsky, exiled to Turkey, was gathering under his flag the discontented and frustrated bureaucrats in the Communist International. Cannon got in personal touch with Trotsky. Only fragments of the discussion ever reached Cannon's followers. Trotsky's denial of Lenin's "Will" Cannon decided to overlook, as well as the fact that Trotsky in a bureaucratic deal rejected and repudiated his Theory of Permanent Revolution. Another point Cannon agreed to "forget" was Trotsky's support to Stalin's policy of attaching the Communist Party of China to Kuomintang which Stalin said could be "revolutionized" (Trotsky's speech to the students of the University of the East).

On October 27, 1928, the Lovestone-Wolfe charlatans at the head of the Workers Communist Party of America, as a service to Stalin, expelled Cannon and his closest companions, Max Shachtman and Martin Abern, the last soon becoming a chief fighter against Cannon's bureaucratism. The first issue of their paper, *The Militant*, dated November 15, made its appearance. The initial, cold-blooded, cynical bundle of ridiculous confusion and nonsense purportedly speaking from the aspect of the interests of the working class, is the following:

"The correctness of the position taken by the Russian Opposition over a period of five years of struggle has been fully confirmed by events. A) The struggle led by L. D. Trotsky since 1923 for Party democracy and against bureaucratism as the pressure of another class upon the Party of the proletariat, was absolutely correct then and is even more so now. The adoption of this position by Zinoviev, Kamenev and others in 1926, and the attempt of Stalin to adopt it now. . . ."

This is fascinating! With the expulsion of the Trotskyist "Left Opposition" Stalin wipes out the few shreds of criticism of his bureaucratic regime his spies detected among the workers. His editors introduce unprecedented ruthlessness of the blue pencil. Following the suicide of Adolph Joffe, one of Trotsky's closest friends, on November 16, 1927, an epidemic of self-destruction spreads among the anti-Stalin workers. Exactly a month after Cannon in his paper had told the advanced workers in America that Stalin was attempting to adopt Trotsky's line of struggle "for Party democracy and against bureaucratism," Trotsky in a letter from Alma Ata to Stalin's Central Committee, said: "Thousands of irreproachable Bolshevik-Leninists whose services to the October revolution and the international proletariat far surpass the services of those who have imprisoned and banished them. . . . Stalin—whom Lenin in his 'Will' called 'rude and disloyal' at a time when those characteristics had not been revealed in even an hundredth part of their present degree. . . . Violence, beating, torture both physical and moral are inflicted on the best Bolshevik workers. . . ." (Cited by Trotsky in *My Life*, p. 561)

But Cannon, not out of touch with the facts, was disseminating with

unblinking shamelessness several major crisp lies: that Trotsky pursued a line for authentic workers democracy; that the two former partners of Stain in the conspiracy against Lenin adopted in 1926 a position for elimination of the bureaucratic system of power; and that Stalin, too, was about to turn toward the "absolutely correct" Trotskyist line!

Cannon and his junior partner, Max Shachtman, proved to be peculiarly suited for the purpose of concealing Trotsky's line of collaboration with Stalin against Lenin, and superb moulder of lies into "truth." They met with a measure of success among uninformed, anti-Stalin workers and intellectuals.

The nascent bourgeoisie fought its battles against the kings and landed aristocracy under the flag purporting to stand for liberation to the toiling masses. But those warring social classes stood outside the camp of the toiling people, workers and peasants. The State bureaucracy, first in Russia and later in other countries, which has replaced the bourgeoisie, is a new breed of exploiters arising from within the working class itself. This unprecedented social formation, in order to preserve itself in power and material comfort, following the example of the bourgeois revolutionists in the memorable days of storming the Bastille and Jacobin terror, must wear a mask of "emancipators" of the masses. It is an enemy of both the bourgeoisie and the proletariat; just as during the unfolding process of Capitalist production, the bourgeoisie was an enemy of the nobility and of the toiling masses. The Trotsky movement, by its origin and politics is affiliated with this element—but with unique attributes not possessed by other subdivisions. Every thorough student of the political biography of Leon Trotsky knows that during Lenin's life he became a powerful bureaucrat in the Bolshevik State. Certain of his ideas contained bureaucratic planning, such, for example, as his design to "shake-up" the "Soviet" trade unions and place in charge of them his own friends. Lenin, though himself chiefly responsible for the bureaucratic essence of the Bolshevik State, threw a revealing light on Trotsky's anti-democratic behavior; "Trotsky resigns from the Commission, disrupts it, refuses to work . . . methods like disrupting a commission are bureaucratic, non-Soviet, non-Socialist, incorrect and politically harmful." (Lenin, "Trade Unions and Mistakes of Trotsky." (*Sel. Works*, IX, p. 21) In another place Lenin said: "The bureaucratic project-hatching character of what Comrade Trotsky has written in his theses is *already proved*." (p. 60). The latter day Trotskyists in the know pretend to pursue the goal of revealing the whole truth about the bureaucratic degeneration of the Bolshevik Party. They fight, so they claim, to effect a political revolution in all the "Socialist" States of cleaning them of bureaucratic corruption. Ironically enough, they must always resist the temptation to drive for State power, even when their forces exceed the numeral strength of their "rival," the Communist Party, as was the case, for a time, in Spain. They sense, as did Trotsky, that, first, the historical record stands against them, second, the Communist Party leadership would never yield its prerogative of seizure of power to the Trotskyites, and third, a victory for the Trotsky leaders would sweep them, as other bureaucrats, away from the path of the democratic tempest which would give the best elements among the workers and intellectuals a quick access to truth.

The only path open to the Trotsky leaders is systematic delivery of the working class into the hands of its enemies.

### A Sample of Conscious Treason of the Trotsky Leadership

In the Thirties Spain was in the tide of the greatest social upheaval in its history. The entire working class and most of the poor peasants voiced the desire to establish Socialism. Stalin, fearing that a possibility might be opened for the seizure of power by the revolutionary workers, and apprehensive of what later became known as "Titoism," since Spain, geographically, was out of the physical reach of his army, furnished his Spanish flunkies with a policy of support to the capitalist system under the formula "Democracy versus Fascism." The Spanish Capitalists, served by the Socialist and the Anarchist leaders, had no alternative but to accept Stalin's assistance. The execution of the revolutionary masses, by Stalin's assignment, was left to Fascism through the pretense of defense of Capitalist democracy.

The Trotsky leaders had no illusions about the precise political content of Stalin's formula. Cannon and Schachtman knew the vast difference between *utilization* of bourgeois democracy in the interests of the proletariat and *support* to bourgeois democracy. They often cited Lenin's statement: "Bourgeois democracy can be supported only by the partisans of Capitalist slavery." (Col. Wks., in Russian, Vol. XVII, p. 43). The Trotskyites wrote in their paper the *Socialist Appeal*, of March 19, 1938: "Policies built upon the preservation of bourgeois democracy not only cannot bar fascism and stave off war—they actually pave the way for these twin evils."

This was the official face of the Trotsky leadership. In actuality this was only a mask. Stalinism operates not only through its key body, the Communist Party, but in a transmission-belt fashion, through various auxiliary organizations. The Trotskyites in the United States, at that time a separate group in the Socialist Party of Norman Thomas, a Left Liberal, gave support to the North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy, organized and guided by Earl Browder, the head of the Communist Party.

Some time elapsed. The bloody drama of concrete Stalinist-Socialist-Liberal sabotage which paved the way for Franco's dictatorship gradually receded in the mind of the Trotskyist rank and file. Then, one day, the Cannon "revolutionary Marxists" printed two statements which amounted to a full, albeit, inadvertent admission by the Trotsky leadership of the *conscious crime* it committed against the toilers of Spain. One statement read: "In that struggle, by the way, the revolutionary Marxists were in favor of giving material support to the Spanish Loyalists because we recognized it to be a struggle between fascism and capitalist democracy and between the two we prefer the latter." (*Militant*, May 24, 1941). In the other statement the Trotskyites said: "To admit the truth would be to confess that bourgeois democracy is not opposite of fascism, but paves the way for fascism in this epoch of Capitalist decay." (Ib.)

The conscious participation by Cannon and Schachtman in the monstrous Stalinist crime of tying the toilers of Spain to vicious Capitalist democracy which, in turn, deliberately sabotaged the war against Franco, is obvious. As to Trotsky himself, he supervised the policy of politically collaborating with Stalin in that crime. This is also recorded in the Trotskyite publications. Thus, "immediately after the accession of Hitler, Trotsky wrote that the issue presenting itself to the masses was no longer Bolshe-

vism versus Fascism but Fascism versus democracy." (*New International*, October 1938, p. 301).

### The Trotskyites During the Proletarian Expropriation of the French Bourgeoisie in May 1968

As in other revolutionary situations, during the upheaval in France in 1968 the Trotsky leaders hastened to cover their true political physiognomy with the brightest revolutionary make-up in their dressing room and acted as the political instructors to the anti-Stalinist and anti-Capitalist students and workers. The sincere but politically uninformed Trotskyist boys and girls superbly defended the students' barricades against de Gaulle's police. Reportedly, it was a group of enthusiastic young Trotskyites who hoisted the red flag over the Sorbonne and over the Arc de Triomphe. Theirs were the lustiest of all the throats singing the *Internationale*. In parades and demonstrations, at meetings, the Trotskyist boys and girls shouted the great, but in the immediate concrete situation, perfectly abstract revolutionary cliches, "For Workers' Power!" "Institute Direct Socialist Democracy!" "Long Live the Socialist Revolution!"

The Trotskyite line for the French proletariat in May 1968 consisted, in the main, of the following: to build everywhere "Action Committees" through which to establish a "dual power," that is workers' power against the bourgeois power. On what program did the "Action Committees" conduct their activity toward that goal? The Trotskyites answer this question: "They functioned on the basis of minimal structure and no definite worked-out program" (*Militant*, June 28, 1968). Designated by the Trotskyites to become a lever "to cover the country with a network of organs of dual power" the Action Committees were a red-flag-waving (the Trotskyites and Maoists) and a black-flag-waving (the Anarchists) revolutionary-shouting political hodge-podge. The Trotskyites themselves indicate this fact: "All political tendencies were free to work in the Action Committees and many of them did. Thus some Committees were known as generally Maoist-oriented, others as committees which usually agreed with the line of activity projected by the Trotskyites, others as anarchists, etc." What trends were implied under "etc." the Trotskyites did not say.

Thus, as they darted around the country setting the stage presumably for establishing a Socialist State, the Trotskyites, their leaders fully aware of all the previous major political crimes of their movement, worked for cooperation, instead of exposure, of every conceivable adventurist sect and group that sounded "good" in attacking de Gaulle and in criticizing the leadership of the Communist Party. No hotter "red" pepper stew was ever served to the Left-most workers and intellectuals in France. What were the political ingredients of this stew?

The Anarchists embrace the view that all States are evil, even a true Socialist State. According to the implication in the Trotskyist line, the Anarchists within the Action Committee worked hand in hand with those who wanted to create a workers' State. The Maoists virtually worship Stalin, the most abominable of traitors to the cause of the working class. The "etc" are no doubt the least conspicuous groups, probably honest, but it is very doubtful whether they had a ghost of understanding who their Trotskyite hosts were historically. There were also in the Action Committee admirers of Fidel Castro, an opponent-supporter of Moscow, and hero-worshippers of Ernesto "Che" Guevara.

A word is in place here about the political character of this glamorous figure. Unquestionably a very courageous man, appearing utterly oblivious to his personal fate, Guevara met death in his capacity of a chief of several hundred guerrillas, fighting the Capitalist-landlord regular army in Bolivian mountains. If this kind of activity could lead to the liberation of the toiling masses from being hired slaves of the Capitalists and landlords, Guevara's struggle would have been vindicated. But his program, Socialist-coated though it appeared, carried no such promise. On occasion he made obvious his goal: to duplicate Castro's Cuban experience and establish a personal, male dictatorship, based not on a free association of the workers of land and factory but on hired labor, on white supremacy, on commercial deals with Franco Spain, as Castro's regime, and label this adventurist set up, "Socialism."

Personal valor, sacrifices, even of life, do not make a correct policy for the toiling masses. In Tsarist Russia the terrorists were men and women of rare heroism and self-abnegation, and many of them perished in martyrdom in prisons or on the gallows.

But with all their subjective loftiness of purpose, they did not fight for the liberation of the working class. Their ultimate goal was to institute Capitalism in Russia. They eventually assumed the name Socialist-Revolutionaries, whom Lenin pointedly characterized as "Social-Reactionaries."

Lenin, quite correctly, based his party-building on the factories. Guevara built no party, but a declassed rebel group, named it "National Liberation Army," leaving, instead of attempting to win over, the advanced factory workers in the hands of the bureaucrats of the pro-Russian and pro-Chinese parties, to whom he applied for material help, instead of exposing them. Lenin in 1917, and Trotsky even before, said: in a large peasant country the working class leading the peasantry effects the overthrow of the Capitalists and the landlords. Guevara, in contrast, said: "Mass struggle in underdeveloped countries with a large peasant base and a large territory must be carried out by a small mobile vanguard."

Guevara disregarded the bed-rock truth that the class struggle of the proletariat for the overthrow of the Capitalists cannot be won by a few hundred declassed, mountain-dwelling rebels. In the last letter to his parents Guevara wrote: "Many call me an adventurer, and that I am . . ." (N.Y.T., Aug. 18, 1968)

A proposal in 1917 to include a Guevara into the leadership of the Bolshevik Party would have stirred laughter even among the Menshevik workers. The Trotsky of 1917 would have winced at Guevara. The chief architect of the October action against the provisional Government of the Capitalists and landlords, Trotsky would have protested furiously against any attempt to link his name with a "Guevara."

But the Trotsky who opposed Lenin's line to weed out and destroy the Stalin clique, the Trotsky who chained the revolutionary masses and the whole Communist International to Stalin by criminally lying that Lenin left no "Will," by approving Stalin's policy to attach the Chinese Communist Party to Chiang Kai-shek, the Trotsky who prostituted himself to Zinoviev, the Trotsky who in 1934 told the revolutionary workers that the destiny of the proletariat hinged on Social Democracy transforming itself and breaking with the bourgeoisie, the Trotsky who urged his organiza-

tion in the United States to render support in elections to the American lackey of Stalin, the leader of the Communist Party, Earl Browder—this Trotsky would have welcomed the picture of Che Guevara next to his own. For, Trotsky's line after he had secretly joined hands with Stalin against Lenin, was to keep the workers' mind far away from realization that he, like Stalin, like the Social Democrats, was in tacit conspiracy with the bourgeoisie to keep the toiling masses in the chains of hiring servitude.

Long before the May 1968 France, the Trotsky leaders developed a Guevara cult in their movement. During the 1968 occupation, in Sorbonne, they established a corner of their own, where they put up a picture of Trotsky, and, a few feet away, that of Che Guevara. Under the Trotskyist influence, "The Institute of Latin America Studies has been renamed the Che Guevara Institute, and students have constructed a statue of Che in the courtyard. The courses of study have been revised and classes in guerrilla warfare are now being taught." (*Militant*, June 14, 1968)

At the moment when all the mental energy of revolutionists should have been concentrated upon finding a correct path toward workers' power in France, the Trotskyite line focused their thoughts on roving groups of guerrillas fighting the regular army somewhere in the mountains of South America!

Because of the vicious attack upon the Left students by the leaders of the Communist Party, and because traditionally, for almost four decades, the Trotskyites appeared to be the most stern critics of that Party's policies, the Left ideas at Sorbonne were primarily of a Trotskyist slant. Stalin's statue, erected by the Maoists, was smashed. The new generation of revolutionary students anxiously peered through the foggy political atmosphere with which the Trotskyites were enveloping their mind, hoping to catch a glimpse of the State structure of authentic Socialist society. The Trotskyite leadership provided them with an outlook. On May 20, 1968, the Trotskyist Fourth International issued an Appeal to the workers (*Militant*, June 7, 1968) in which, amidst revolutionary verbiage loudly proclaiming the beginning of Socialist Revolution in France, it advanced the slogan, "Long Live the United States of Europe!"

Every person familiar with Lenin's writings before he took power knows very well that United States of Europe can be nothing else but an alliance of Capitalist States in competition with the American imperialists whose power, already in Lenin's day, was rapidly expanding. In 1915 Lenin and his collaborators declared that they "arrived at the conclusion of incorrectness of the slogan United States of Europe." (*Against the Current*, Rus. p. 131). Today "United States of Europe" could be merely a loose bloc of several bourgeois countries on the Continent, led by French Capitalists, against the colossal economic competition of the United States. On the other hand, Lenin wrongly imagined that the following thesis was correct: "United States of the World (not Europe) represents that State form of unification and freedom of nations, which we connect with Socialism." (Ib.)

Lenin did not realize, when he wrote this, that the existence of several, or even of only two States, signifies that the human race is a considerable distance from Socialism. Under Socialism—not the "Socialism" exemplified by the "Warsaw Pact" nations—only one State is possible. In the United States of the World, as in the United States of Europe, there

would be big and small national units, a situation generating national and racial inequality and a form of national and racial oppression. Such slogans could lead either to a Capitalist or, today, to "Marxist-Leninist" bureaucratic national formation, under the hegemony of Moscow. The only answer to State fragmentation of the human race, to hiring servitude, to big nation supremacy, to male supremacy, to white supremacy, and—this must be never lost from view—to the military threat of extinction of the species, is one, international, interracial, bi-sexually guided, democratic world workers' State.

Perhaps a word on the ultimate fate of every section of the international Trotskyist movement will help to round out the understanding of this unique "whipping boy" of the Stalinist bureaucracy.

In 45 years of its existence the Trotskyite leaders avoided to seize the power of the State either in Russia or abroad. They can function freely only in bourgeois-democratic countries. If France or the United States, or England, turns to Fascism, Trotskyites are doomed to destruction together with all Left groups. Should the Stalinist bureaucrats ever establish themselves as the rulers of France, the Trotskyites in that country will be murdered. However, if the authentic Socialist Revolution, not a remote possibility at all, sweeps France, or any other country, the Trotskyite leaders, *but not the deceived followers*, will be brought before the revolutionary tribunal, side by side with the leaders of the Communist Party and the bureaucrats of the Socialist organizations, the betrayers of the French and other toiling masses.

In every revolutionary situation the Trotsky leadership takes possession of the mind of the most militant, revolutionary youth, the basic building material for constructing a sacrificial slaughterhouse of the Trotskyites. The revolutionary crisis in the May 1968 France was no exception. In an irate dispatch to the *Worker*, central organ of the Communist Party of the United States, the French Trotskyist Youth Organization, walking in a political dream, said: "Didn't the CPUSA support Johnson in the 1964 presidential election? . . . You are miserable agents of the counterrevolution cast in the same mold as your French counterparts, who have exposed themselves so clearly in these past weeks. Our confidence and our solidarity go entirely to the Socialist Workers Party and the Young Socialist Alliance, the true inheritors of the tradition of Lenin and Trotsky." (*Militant*, June 21, 1968)

#### **A Safeguard Against the Transformation of the Leaders of the Proletariat into the Betrayers of the Proletariat**

It is trite to speak of the leadership of the toiling masses betraying them in the name of their liberation, without determining the motive which propels it to betray their trust. The way to the answer why the Bolsheviks underwent moral decomposition is pointed by the classical examples of amazing transformation of the leaders of slave uprisings into enslavers. Transformations of one element into another are not confined to chemistry. A combination of oxygen and hydrogen produces water. Leaders of the most famous chattel slave and peasant insurrections, from Spartacus to Pugachev, in the moment of triumph and acquisition of personal power, abandon the thoughts of liberation of the slaves and succumb to the passion which possessed the overthrown masters. The State-bureaucratic degeneration of the leadership of the proletariat, is, of course, a

new phenomenon. The pattern was set in Russia. Through the flexibility of speech and ingenuity of entrapping technique, the vanguard of the proletariat was captured by the renegades, almost automatically, in one Capitalist country after another, and attached to the personal ambitions of the bureaucrats. The adventurers of revolution all over the world, their imagination fired by the vision of seeing themselves securing State power, like leaches attached themselves to the body of the proletariat. Hoping some day to emulate the Moscow bureaucracy, and a few of them eventually did, like Mao Tse-tung, they sank into depths of hypocrisy previously unknown to the human race. The lesson for the vanguard to learn from horrible experience is: adopt the principle of keeping the leadership of the working class movement from occupying posts of State power. There is no greater safeguard against the transformation of the top leaders, even of sterling integrity, into conniving and treacherous self-seeking bureaucrats. The temptation to assume personal power over society is irresistible in a setting which permits, encourages, and contributes to this transmutation. The legality of a socially oppressive feature, such, for example, as chattel slavery in the pre-Capitalist world, gains recognition as a normal, almost biological condition of human existence. The highest circles of the imperialist bourgeoisie control and direct their political heads of the State, even a Hitler or Mussolini. But when a Stalin gets his bearings there is no one in State ownership of economy to curb his appetite for unlimited personal power. Don't shrug off the Stalinist experience. Put up an insurmountable obstacle to the degeneration of leadership, eradicate the policy centered upon the lifting of political leaders into administrative seats, and you will discourage bureaucratic climbers from flocking into the proletarian camp, because the incentive to join the flashy elite in power will be eliminated. There is a fundamental difference between the trade union and political leaders of the past and those of the current era. The Nineteenth Century leaders of the working class, impressed by the severity of exploitation of the masses, morally incorruptible, virtually all in their youth were sincere in their desire to abolish the slavery of the working class. During the building of the "Soviet" State most of them became renegades, especially in the wake of the seductive doctrine introduced in Bolshevik Russia that even bureaucrats could work for Socialism. Originally one of the most straightforward rebellious youths, William Z. Foster, who had proclaimed as his goal the "abolition of the wage system," dropped this motto, never to take it up again, as he turned into an agent of Stalinism and a conscious betrayer of the working class.

Contrary to the courageously honest youthful leaders of the pre-1917 past, the present leading cadres in the Socialist, Trotskyist and Communist Party youth organizations begin as political flunkies of the adult bureaucrats who are the most treacherous enemies of the working class inside its camp.

#### **Treason to Socialism in Czechoslovakia**

Stalin's managerial dictatorship in the countries he wrested from the Nazis was effected by means of frame-ups, murder and Nazi-like suppression of intellect. His death (March 1953) brought relief to his henchmen, who had been periodically decimated by him. In 1956, at the Twentieth Party Congress, his very recent lieutenants, Khrushchev, Brezhnev,

Mikoyan, and others, opened a drive of de-Stalinization, castigating Stalinist practices. A considerable latitude of freedom to denounce the "cult of personality," as Stalin's tyranny was now described was allowed to writers and speakers. The partial lifting of the blockade against criticism was initially a mere streamlet. In a few weeks after the Congress it began to expand, becoming a turbulent and angry river in Moscow's territorial sphere of power beyond the borders of the USSR. It took on not only a strong anti-Stalin tone but also an intense anti-Russian coloration. The Russian armed forces, considered by many as merely "overnight guests," were soon recognized not merely as permanent residents but as the factual master of the estate. The terrifying night of body-snatching and replicas of the weird Moscow Trials conducted by the local leaders of the Communist Parties under Stalin's direction, created a deep-seated resentment against both "Communism" and Russian domination. After Khrushchev introduced a sort-of-a Liberal line, a breath of new life was drawn by the workers, students, peasants and also by the remnants of the former bourgeoisie. The emotionally-charged situation exploded into the streets. In East Germany, Ulbrecht, a seasoned Stalinist bureaucrat, in Poland, Gomulka, quite recently in the unscrupulous service of Stalin, were quick in coping with the rebellion. But in Hungary, a country of strong anti-Semitic traditions for many centuries, the Jewish director of the Communist Party, Rakosi, lost control of the events. The popular insurrection against the leadership, at first governed by the idea of establishing a Titoist national independence, in a few days succumbed to the guidance of the Church headed by Cardinal Mindszenti, and to the overpowering influence of the strongly chauvinistic anti-Semitic Horthy Fascists who raised the slogans "Down with the Jew Rakosi!" and "Down with the Jews!" Khrushchev and his bureaucrats in Budapest, realizing that "Socialist" words could no longer prove effective, waited for a propitious moment to use the Russian tanks. And when the Fascist stage came sharply into view, definitely denoting a shift toward Capitalism, the "Soviet" soldiers, enraged by the spectacle of Lenin's picture being thrown by the Hungarian "Freedom Fighters" upon bonfires, just as in Germany under Hitler, eagerly advanced into Budapest to crush the pro-Capitalist uprising and retain Hungary for the Kremlin.

In Czechoslovakia, the leadership topped by Novotny was not in a hurry to make the de-Stalinization turn. His "conscience" was laden with unspeakable crimes instigated by Stalin. One of the most revolting of these crimes in which Novotny actively participated was the frame-up and execution of Slansky, a comrade and a friend, and nine other leaders of the Communist Party. Novotny, becoming First Secretary of the Communist Party in November 1957, dodged for six years the issue of rehabilitating Slansky and many other victims whom he had helped Stalin to send to their untimely graves. Finally, in August 1963, he absolved Slansky and others of the fabricated charges of treason. Novotny, yielding to very strong pressure, allowed a measure of reform. He permitted in the Central Committee of the Communist Party a degree of opposition to his rule. The anti-Novotny elements gathered around Alexander Dubcek, who, angling for Novotny's place, succeeded him in January 1968.

The State structure of Czechoslovakian "Socialism" under Novotny, and after December 1967, under Dubcek, was entirely different from that in the USSR. Lenin in 1917, raising the slogan "All Power to the Soviets,"

(the councils of workers', soldiers', and peasants' deputies) asserted that these bodies represented the historically correct form of workers' power. On the other hand, such organs of State as National Assembly, or Constitutional Assembly, he analyzed to be of bourgeois character. Because all non-Bolshevik organizations in Russia, the Monarchists, Liberals, Mensheviks, SRs, Anarchists, headed in a single direction toward Capitalism, Lenin suppressed them.

The leaders of the Czechoslovak Party never adhered to Lenin's generally correct assessment of Soviets as the only conceivable form of authentic workers' State. They never organized proletarian councils. They made use of a bourgeois form, the National Assembly, prescribed by Stalin. Although the Capitalists of Czechoslovakia have long since been dispossessed, many in personal and class disaster left the country, others entering the service of the bureaucracy, several half-suppressed pro-Capitalist parties, used for consultation and "democratic" window-dressing, were allowed to exist under the guise of assisting to build Socialism. Patiently hoping, in painful silence, to restore some day Capitalism in Czechoslovakia, were the following major organizations: the Socialist Party, organized in 1897, composed of intellectuals with a sprinkling of lesser State bureaucrats and workers; the People's Party, formed in 1922, with a Catholic membership, mostly workers and peasants; the Party of Slovak Rebirth, founded in 1948, representing the aspiration of Slovak intellectuals whose narrow Nationalist goal was separation from the Czechs; and the Freedom Party, a Left Liberal formation, originating in 1946, counting among its followers former shopkeepers, bourgeoisie-minded professionals and Rightist workers and intellectuals. This "revolutionary-proletarian" facade, a combination of pro-Moscow and pro-Washington tendencies, resting on hiring servitude, bureaucratic privileges, and male supremacy, was passed off as *Socialism*!

Lenin was the first to declare that Soviets represented the historical form of the working class State. But he and the rest of the Bolshevik leadership were responsible for development of bureaucratism in the Bolshevik State. The chief organ of the Bolshevik Party about three years after October 1917 wrote: "The danger of bureaucratism was evident from the very first steps of the proletarian revolution." (*Pravda*, Dec. 14, 1920). However, the working class form of the State served as a shield against restoration of Capitalism.

The Czechoslovak leaders of the Communist Party ruled through the National Assembly, a bourgeois form of State, and therefore, sooner or later, would find themselves on an edge of a knife balancing between Capitalism and the "Marxist-Leninist" State system of bureaucratic exploitation.

In order to depose Novotny, the Dubcek-Svoboda group required a line. What could produce greater support among the Party members, government functionaries, and especially among workers, students and writers, than criticism of the snail-paced crawling of the Novotny group in the matter of de-Stalinization and introduction of promised reforms!

In January 1968 Dubcek emerged as the victor. He assumed a pose of a confirmed believer in unimpeded democracy. Ironically, the "Liberalization" went ahead of his game. The lifting of censorship removed the old rigidity of thought and expression and the painful strain of compliance with the official ideas and orders. Obviously, the "Liberalization"

was not as expertly engineered as the "thaw" in the USSR. Discussion circles bobbed up all over the place, making their business to examine the various Left leanings and movements abroad. A magazine in Prague openly reproduced a large part of the Trotskyist "Manifesto of the Fourth International," a shockingly daring deed in the eyes of Moscow, and no doubt of Dubcek.

Extremely daring revolutionary ideas appearing in the columns of certain papers and journals of Czechoslovakia could worry the calmest of bureaucrats. The Trotskyist *Militant* of August 2, 1968, enthusiastically presented to its readers an article by a professor Zbynek Fiser, who in a paper, *Nova Svoboda* (New Freedom), openly discussed the question of "workers' self-management" and voiced an anti-bureaucratic warning: "There is a real danger that workers' self-management can become camouflage for the manipulation of the workers by the management."

Such pro-working class, virtually 1917-1918 thoughts, if developed, could set in motion a wave of workers' resistance to the bureaucratic order, with ominous repercussions in all the other States of the Warsaw Pact, even in the USSR itself.

Incidentally, as we observe, the Trotskyist leaders responded feverishly to the seeming advance of "Liberalization" toward the fulfillment of the dreams of workers' ideals. The usual Trotskyist technique of producing false hopes, and at the same time of creating the effect of fighting for their realization, was repeated in application to the situation in Czechoslovakia.

### Brezhnev Facing Problems in Czechoslovakia

While under Dubcek, Czechoslovakia was sliding toward bourgeois democracy, with the perspective of entering into Washington's sphere of influence, the USSR, under the Brezhnev-Kosygin regime, had begun to exhume Stalinism. Favorable remarks to Stalin appeared in conversation, even in the press. The Battle of Stalingrad, which under Khrushchev was renamed "The Battle of the Volga" was again called the Battle of Stalingrad. A film was in the making somewhat glorifying Stalin. Signs began to multiply indicating recrudescence of Stalinist practices of repressions of criticism of the policies of the ruling bureaucrats.

As neo-Stalinists, Brezhnev-Kosygin faced a number of sharply-defined tasks in Czechoslovakia. They were impelled to stop, at any cost, its going into the economic and therefore political direction of West Germany and American imperialism, or what was absolutely imperative for sustaining Moscow's prestige within the working masses, to block the road leading to Tito, or even the worst, to Mao. The workers and intellectuals leaning to the Trotskyites had to be exterminated. The existence of Social Democracy, a rallying force against Moscow, had to be terminated once and for all. The country, if possible with Dubcek, otherwise with a reorganized crew of obedient flunkies, must be drawn tightly and permanently into the Kremlin's system of States, otherwise the Warsaw Pact would fall apart altogether.

On this premise a plan was laid out by the Moscow top bureaucrats and acquiesced in by the miserable "dictators" in Prague.

The strategem was brilliantly executed. First, the announcement was made that, by agreement with the Czechoslovak authorities, maneuvers

of the Warsaw Pact military forces would be conducted in Czechoslovakia. Dubcek calmed the alarmed masses. This would be no more than maneuvers. The Russians would stay a very short while and would depart. This sounded like a valid reasoning, and though a bit jittery, the population showed no emotion of suspicion. Sure enough, the Russians came and went. From this seemingly harmless beginning came the stunning climax of the plot. On the 20-21 of August 1968, a mighty Russian army at the head of lesser detachments of Warsaw Pact troops, recrossed into Czechoslovakia. Dubcek immediately called upon the population not to resist.

For a few days the whereabouts of the Czechoslovak chiefs remained a mystery. Presumably, they were under arrest, handcuffed, on the way to Russian prisons. Word was out that Dubcek was executed. Suddenly, the news came from Moscow that they were there.

The official visitor to Moscow was Svoboda, formerly Stalin's ardent admirer and ally, holder of the medal "Hero of the Soviet Union."

Three days after the Brezhnev-Kosygin forces had entered Czechoslovakia, the August 24 issue of the *Daily World*, official organ of the Communist Party U.S.A., printed a report from Moscow which disclosed that the "prisoners," who evidently had never entertained the intention to flee either into Austria, West Germany, or some other Capitalist country, or Yugoslavia, where, undoubtedly, they could have secured a friendly asylum, were guests of honor in the "Soviet" capital. "Svoboda was met at Vnukovo 2 Airport, reserved for distinguished visitors, by the ruling Troika of the Soviet Government and the government-party chairman, Leonid Brezhnev, Premier Alexei Kosygin and President Nikolai Podgorny."

The "ruling Troika!" How familiar the phrase sounds in the ears of those who remember the first ruling Troika in the history of the bureaucratic development—Stalin, Zinoviev and Kamenev (1922-1925) with whom Trotsky formed full unity at the Twelfth Congress of the Bolshevik Party (April 1923).

"Svoboda said he expected to return to Prague tonight but a small palace inside the Kremlin was prepared in the event he stayed on." (*Daily World*, Aug. 29, 1968).

Along the route to the Kremlin Svoboda was greeted by masses of "Soviet" workers who had been given the afternoon off for that purpose by their bureaucratic managers. The route was profusely decorated with Czechoslovak and "Soviet" flags.

Dubcek came to Moscow separately, as a "prisoner," but the reception for this "prisoner" was of the most cordial kind: "Mr. Dubcek, who had arrived in Moscow as a virtual prisoner, received the same kisses and embraces from the principal Soviet leaders as did President Svoboda, their official guest." (N.Y.T. August 28, 1968, 17).

The leading Czech bureaucrats were visiting their friends, not enemies.

### Dubcek and Svoboda as Minions of the Kremlin

From the beginning of the crisis to its crescendo, all the talks between the leaders of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and of the USSR, as between Stalin and Hitler, were carried on in strict secrecy. The ears of the workers and intellectuals, well stuffed with political

cotton by the ideological policemen of both exploiting systems, are kept at a great distance from the walls behind which plots, intrigues, agreements, are concocted or scrapped, by the Capitalists and the "Marxist-Leninist" oppressors and exploiters. The honored guests from the Russian-occupied Czechoslovakia and their masters-hosts, after a few rounds of secret verbal gyrations, arrived at a "compromise." Dubcek-Svoboda, with the aid of Russian military forces, would eliminate non-Party press, clamp down upon the Communist Party publications a strict censorship, crush the officially unspecified and unidentified counterrevolutionists, and adhere without reservations to the rules of the Warsaw Pact.

The Czech protagonists in the tragedy of the sellout to the Kremlin returned home. A few days later the chief organ of the Communist Party of the USSR printed a report from Prague: "The First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, A. Dubcek, informed the Plenum of the negotiations of the President of the Republic, L. Svoboda and the representatives of C.C. of C.P.C. and of the Government, with the leaders of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet Government" (*Pravda*, Sept. 3, 1968). What was Dubcek's recommendation to his Party? "In conclusion of his report, and then in conclusion of the discussion at the Plenum, A. Dubcek stressed particularly the following main ideas: the negotiations in Moscow have created a new, much more favorable situation to which it is necessary consistently adjust the political position of the entire Party."

The Moscow maneuver to irrevocably cut off Czechoslovakia from the road to Capitalism, to establish once and for all the understanding among all the peripheral States politically and militarily closely associated with the Kremlin what their manifest destiny is, was worthy of high praise from the unsurpassed virtuoso of snares and treachery under the sign of "Socialism," Joseph Stalin.

Upon the masses and the honest intellectuals of Czechoslovakia descended a macabre atmosphere of imprisonment of the mind. They were condemned, while Dubcek and Svoboda, not at all sure they would be permitted by their Russian masters to hold on to power in their "own" country, had returned from Moscow with the rope. And suddenly a glimpse of the shocking and revolting truth about the treacherous Dubcek set began to penetrate the mind of some of the bewildered victims. Especially critical were the students. They expressed a feeling far stronger than chagrin: "The mood of Prague youth was evident in a protest by 1,000 students who marched into the National Assembly building in the downtown area shouting that the Moscow agreement, which is known only in vague terms, was a sell-out." (Dispatch from Prague, N.Y.T., August 28, 1968, 15).

#### A Would-be Appeal to the Czechoslovak Workers

If there had been a party in Czechoslovakia standing upon a program for an authentic Socialist Revolution, it would have addressed the workers in approximately these terms:

Workers of Czechoslovakia! For many decades you were slaves of your Capitalists. Often in the history of Bohemia and of Slovakia, the two chief components of the present Czechoslovakian State, you were under the iron heel of powerful conquerors, the Hapsburgs, Napoleon,

Hitler. But that did not constitute the essence of your thraldom. They brought foreign oppression, not only to you but also to your Capitalists and landlords. The principal form of the bondage of your class consists in the fact that you are subject to hiring and stand on the bottom of the social ladder. If national oppression were paramount in your condition of enslavement, then you have been liberated many times over. Through the magic of radiant words poured out by clever Capitalist demagogues, you were designated as "free labor" after the fall of the Hapsburg Austro-Hungarian Empire in 1918 and the establishment of independence of Czechoslovakia. Then came Hitler, and a few years afterward, a fascinating moment in your life when Stalin's armies released you from the maddening Nazi tyranny. Following the big military storm, from 1943 to 1948, the Socialists and the Stalinists persisted in the fiction that you were enjoying freedom, and were represented by the National Front, a bourgeois-Stalinist concoction. Then in 1948, Stalin's servile leader of the Czechoslovakian Communist Party, Gothwald, broke his constitutional bargain with the pro-Capitalist parties and seized control of the State. Stalin thereby took you away from the bourgeoisie and transformed you into "Socialist labor," with a new hiring master, the Czechoslovak bureaucracy, composed, in considerable numbers, of former Capitalist managers, and Socialist turncoats.

Many horrendous crimes were committed by Stalin's despicable hand-picked Czechoslovak menials. The oppression of the workers was intensified. Features of Russification were imposed. Intellect was stifled, as in Russia, glorification of Stalin was obligatory. The products you turned out in the factories were sold on the world market, as in the days of your "freedom" under the bourgeoisie, and the amount of money received by the bureaucrats above the cost of materials and the outlay of the hiring price was the portion they robbed you of your labor.

Stalin died, the extreme form of terror was lifted, but the form and essence of exploitation of the workers, hiring slavery, remained as it had been for centuries. In the eternal bureaucratic plots for personal power, the new First Secretary of the Communist Party, Dubcek, and President Svoboda cracked the Novotny group by wrapping themselves in the cloak of reformers of Stalinist "Socialism." This won them the acclaim of the population, but, as often happens to bourgeois reformists, the ringing protests against the preceding oppressive regime awakened critical reflections among the workers and intellectuals upon the prevailing social conditions, and gave rise to a search for new perspectives. "Liberalization" brought a threat to Dubcek and to his companions. They required the aid of the Kremlin's military power as the only way out of their dilemma. These bureaucrats may eventually be replaced with a new set, despite the Brezhnev-Kosygin present commitments and assurances, but this risk was unavoidable for them.

The Russian soldiers are here. To attempt ousting them by force is sheerest ultra-Leftist madness. The Dubcek line is to submit supinely to the Russian military occupation. He will never introduce a process of revolutionary fraternization between the Czech workers and the Russian soldiers. Any intelligent inquirer into all the major aspects of victory of the Bolshevik Revolution knows what an extremely important part fraternization between the Russian and the German soldiers played in the overthrow of the Capitalist regime of Kerensky.

Not to gloss over, but to emphasize the hiring status of the workers under both the Capitalists and the "Marxist-Leninist" bureaucrats, is the duty of the revolutionists. We must explain to the Russian soldiers that, insofar as the working class is concerned, there is no fundamental difference in the master-servant relationship between a bourgeois lady who hires a maid or a cook, and a "Soviet" general's wife who hires peasant girls to wash and scrub and prepare the meals for her family, while she does her dignified chores in "Socialist" construction.

Workers of Czechoslovakia! Adopt the "1917" policy of revolutionary fraternization! Call upon the Russian soldiers to unite with you, with the anti-slavery workers of all lands, Capitalist and the so-called "Socialist," to free the proletariat from hiring servitude!

#### A Would-be Appeal to the Russian Soldiers in Czechoslovakia

A party advocating abolition of hiring servitude, abolition of the division of the human race into separate States, the fragmentation which is one of the causes of war, a trend calling for the termination of the supremacy of the male sex, a tendency proposing to construct a world cooperative society through amalgamation under one State, based on equality of races and the sexes, would unfold before the Russian soldiers a picture unfamiliar to their consciousness but seen mechanically by them in every-day life:

Soldiers of the "Soviet" Army! Let us all face a very disagreeable truth: there is no Socialism in Czechoslovakia, and never was; there is no Socialism in Russia, and never was, and never will be under a bureaucracy. All these "Socialist" countries, China, Yugoslavia, Poland, and the others, are nationalist-bureaucratic societies composed of a privileged upper crust and the underprivileged oppressed workers and peasants. There is a West Germany and there is an East Germany, and their rulers boast they both emerged from the Nazi dictatorship as democratic, free societies in which the toiling masses have been liberated. We reply to this: there is a considerable difference between these two German States in ideology, in the form of economy, in politics. But in substance they are both founded on the enslavement of the working class, both puppets of great powers, one of American imperialism, the other of Russian "Socialist" bureaucracy. We stand against both systems of oppression, of exploitation, of unspeakable crimes. We say, Johnson, his Australian, South Korean and other henchmen had no business to send their troops into Vietnam, and Brezhnev, East Germany, Poland, and other of his henchmen, had no business to send their armies to Czechoslovakia.

We consider Dubcek, Brezhnev, Ulbricht, Kadar, Zhivkov, Tito, Mao, Castro, as *traitors inside the workers' camp*. We regard Johnson, de Gaulle and all the rest of the heads of the Capitalist governments as the eminent hirelings of the powerful financial interests, our *external* class enemies. The class struggle of the proletariat has been conducted by its leaders for many decades not in the interests of its emancipation but to effect its transfer from the class-ownership by the bourgeoisie into the possession of the bureaucratic oppressors and exploiters, its own leaders.

Soldiers of the Red Army! You are members of the working class. We shall welcome your presence in Czechoslovakia if you side with the workers against the bureaucrats, against the Capitalists, in the struggle for authentic Socialism, for a system of society not based on hiring human

beings but on an organized free cooperation of all workers. Unlike the deceived Czechoslovak masses, unlike the pro-Titoists, pro-Maoists, Trotskyists, Socialists, and Anarchists, who shout "Russians go home!" we say: *You have no home*. When Russia belonged to the Tsar, your grandfathers in the War of 1914 sacrificed their lives in the interests of the Tsar, of the landed nobility and the Capitalists. In March 1917 the workers smashed the Monarchy and for two days were the masters of Petrograd, the capital of Russia. But almost overnight the Capitalists came into ascendancy. Between March and October passionate but thoughtful discussions went on among the masses who weighed the ideas and platforms submitted to them by various political parties inside the working class to decide what form of State to establish in Russia. At length they accepted the Bolshevik programmatic view "to establish, on a nation-wide scale, a precise and scrupulous system of accounting and control, control by the workers, over the production and distribution of commodities." (Lenin, *Can the Bolsheviks Retain State Power*).

When the workers, sailors and soldiers toppled the Capitalist government, they, momentarily, were the true masters of Russia. But soon Russia was stolen from them by bureaucrats. Today, Russia belongs to a powerful, privileged bureaucracy, while the workers there have no control over production and distribution of commodities, no voice in the selection of leaders, no right to question the State policy, are conditioned in a renewed Stalinist atmosphere to approve every violation of the programmatic pledges of 1917.

True, Czechoslovakia at present is not your home either. However, we ask you to make Czechoslovakia your living quarters, not as tools of the Russian bureaucracy, but as our class-brothers, as a contingent of soldiers-workers, to struggle for transferring Czechoslovakia, Russia, France, England, America, the whole globe, into the possession of the toiling people. Let us fight for the fulfilment of the programmatic pledges the Bolshevik leaders made to the workers, sailors, soldiers and peasants in 1917, and to expand the revolutionary horizon beyond "1917" ideas. The history of the half century since the October Revolution has indicated the requirement to broaden the Bolshevik platform of 1917 by an addition of three vital positions: 1) abolition of hiring human beings, totally and absolutely, in the precise meaning of the term; 2) the leaders of the workers must never be entrusted with administrative posts or with any functions involving commanding relationship with other members of the community, lest the leaders become transformed into State bureaucrats; 3) direct, immediate, factual equality of both sexes in all social activity, essential for eradicating oppression of one sex by the other.

Soldiers of the "Soviet" Army! Very few of you know precisely what position Lenin advanced before October regarding the selection of officers for a true proletarian army. He posed the question: "Should officers be elected by the soldiers?" and he answered: "Not only must they be elected, but every step of every officer and general must be supervised by persons specially elected for the purpose by the soldiers." (*Political Parties in Russia and the Tasks of the Proletariat*).

Revising the old program of the Party, Lenin proposed: "Election by the people of judges and other officials, both civil and military, with the right to recall any of them at any time by decision of a majority of their electors."

Did the toiling masses elect Stalin? No, that bureaucratic pirate and traitor to 1917 Bolshevism literally stole power from Lenin in 1922-1923 through a secret deal with other bureaucrats, specifically with Zinoviev, Kamenev, and Trotsky. For many years that despot terrorized the masses, rigged "elections," murdered, butchered tens of thousands of bureaucrats and millions of toilers.

Again, were Brezhnev and Kosygin elected by the Russian people? Did, at least the rank and file of the Communist Party discuss their fitness to take the place of Khrushchev, one of the most hypocritical henchmen of Stalin? No, these bureaucratic pirates and traitors to 1917 Bolshevism conspired behind Khrushchev's back in the dark of the moon, literally while the unsuspecting merry head of the State retired for the night, and in the morning confronted him with the greatest and most tragic to him surprise of his life. The pictures of the usurpers were posted on billboards, in the Government buildings; and the Russian masses, in utter amazement, learned that during the night they had "elected" new leaders to pilot the "Soviet" State.

Look at the internal policy of these usurpers. The process of de-Stalinization has been halted. Neo-Stalinism is now creeping into daily life. The system of absolute submission of the masses to the bureaucracy, and of the bureaucracy to the center of power exercised by the Brezhnev-Kosygin team, has been tightened through the termination of the "thaw," as the temporary loosening of the shackles following Stalin's death was called. Even a near-attempt at criticism of the regime is severely suppressed by relentless censorship and punishment by the courts. Writers, Daniel and Sinyavsky, for publishing abroad a vague hint at the bureaucratic life in Russia are now languishing in prison, both in broken health, doing a many years sentence of hard labor. Intellectuals and workers who protested this brutality have been terrorized, and a number of them thrown into prison. A while ago a letter had been slipped out of the USSR written by a woman-participant in a public demonstration in Moscow opposing Brezhnev-Kosygin's military intrusion into Czechoslovakia. The woman, with fantastic courage defying the oppressors, publicly revealed her name and address: "Natalya Gorbunovskaya, 3/13 Novopeschanskaya Street, Moscow." The demonstration consisted of only seven individuals, mostly intellectuals, but its force resided in the fact that they dared to criticise the policy of the cruel rulers in an atmosphere of terror. She wrote: "At noon we sat down on the parapet on Lobnoye Mesto and unfolded banners proclaiming 'Long live a free and independent Czechoslovakia!' " (N.Y.T., August 29, 1968). The group was immediately set upon by Brezhnev's police. "As they ran up to us they shouted 'These are all Jews!'" Moscow police took a page from the police brutalities of the Chicago, Paris, Mexico City and other Capitalist centers and severely beat the demonstrators. She concluded: "We hope that the people of Czechoslovakia have learned or will learn about this. The belief that the Czechs and Slovaks, when thinking about the Soviet people will think not only about the occupier but also about us gives us strength and courage."

Think about this little group of seven people in Moscow in a public square openly and fearlessly facing a colossal bureaucratic machine of ideological and physical terror directed by Brezhnev-Kosygin!

But is it not strangely odd that of two hundred and forty million

people in the USSR only seven individuals, without drawing a large curious crowd, in the most populous city in the country, protested the Russian military intrusion into Czechoslovakia? Did this extraordinary "miserable" showing, unquestionably the most "wretched" of all the demonstrations ever held in Russia, with no visible support from a single passer-by, indicate the free and warm backing by the population to the policy of rolling Russian tanks, with a threat to open fire, through the cities of Czechoslovakia? No, it attests the fact that the very opposite from the 1917 program has been carried out in Russia. This eloquent silence of the "Soviet" masses proves to any intelligent person that something is mysteriously binding the freedom of speech there. And what is it if not the fear of the police, the so-called "militia," the fear of the army, supposedly a *Socialist* army, fear of prisons, of frame-ups, of tortures, of murder? Obviously, Stalinism, after a brief "thaw," rides again!

Soldiers of the USSR! We call your attention to the remark attributed to Brezhnev's police in Gorbunovskaya's letter: "These are all Jews." You no doubt know something about anti-Semitism. It is a social poison used by ruling classes in the Ancient, Medieval and modern world. Its function is to divert the attention of the masses in ferment from their oppressors and exploiters into the channel of hatred of Jews, who are discredited as a social element and blackened by experts with all sorts of monstrous accusations and defamations. It is widespread in Christendom, the malicious Ancient fabrication about the Jews murdering the founder of Christianity being a powerful pillar buttressing anti-Semitism. The use of the Jews as a convenient scapegoat usually, although not always, culminates with mass butcheries of these people. The classical modern examples are the massacres conducted by the Tsarist bandits of power during the upheaval of the Russian masses in 1905-6, and the Hitlerite exterminations of Jews. The magnitude of the horror can be gleaned from the fact that out of three and a half million Polish Jews only thirty thousand are living now in that country, under the regime of the head of the Communist Party, Gomulka.

Quite recently the Polish students protested against Gomulka's policies of submission to the Brezhnev-Kosygin leaders of the USSR. Gomulka and his high associates immediately branded the unrest in the universities as a "Zionist" intrigue, attacking and expelling Jews from the Communist Party, and bringing back the horror-gripping memories of Hitler to the handful of Jews, survivors of his concentration camps. The use of "Zionism" has been extended by the Gomulka servitors of the Kremlin to justify the Polish participation in the occupation of Czechoslovakia. Read Gomulka's army paper, distributed here among the Polish soldiers. In the issue of September 5, 1968 it explains the continued mood of resistance of the Czechoslovak workers and students thus: "certain forces hostile to Socialism—revisionist and Zionist forces—do not have now the slightest intention of considering the 'matter settled.' "

You know that when the Warsaw Pact troops entered Czechoslovakia many people fled the country. A dispatch from Vienna to a Capitalist paper in New York reports: "A significant number of Czechoslovaks looking for work in Vienna said they were Jewish and asserted that a major reason for their flight from Czechoslovakia was what they termed resurgent anti-Semitism in the Soviet bloc." (N.Y.T., Sept. 6, 1968.)

In East Germany the chief paper of the Communist Party, Neues

Deutschland, of August 25, 1968 used the "Zionist" smokescreen to explain the military expedition into Czechoslovakia: "Zionist forces have taken over the leadership."

Soldiers of the Red Army, look at the foreign policy, short-range and long, of the Brezhnev-Kosygin leadership. Stalin made deals with the imperialists, even with Hitler; the present rulers of the USSR follow his general pattern. You probably know that the revolutionary line against war, enunciated by Lenin in 1915, and strongly emphasized by him in 1917, is fraternization between the soldiers of opposing armies. Concerned largely with the problem of preventing war, a phenomenon which may expand into a nuclear holocaust, we believe in the application of the principle of fraternization in Vietnam, in the Middle East, on the Chinese-Russian border, and elsewhere. The representatives of Moscow bureaucracy have been meeting for many years in hypocritical, secret "fraternization" with the agents of Washington imperialism which, at the same time, has been tearing the bleeding body of the Vietnamese toilers as the lions in ancient Rome tore the slaves thrown to them into the arena. The Brezhnev traitors to "1917" Bolshevism have for a time been on cordial terms with the semi-dictator de Gaulle, the most vicious oppressor of the French workers. Brezhnev-Kosygin initiated "cultural exchange" with the old butcher of the Spanish workers, General Franco. Brezhnev-Kosygin help the Indian bourgeoisie with arms against "Socialist" China. In the Israeli-Arab war, avoiding the correct line of fraternization between the soldiers, of calling for the overthrow of both sets of masters, Brezhnev-Kosygin are collaborating with the Fascist dictator Nasser who keeps in his dungeons the Arab Communist workers and intellectuals. Brezhnev-Kosygin are helping even the sheiks who maintain *chattel slavery* in Arabia.

Wake up, soldiers of the Red Army. Help make Czechoslovakia a country of freedom for the toiling masses. Like from an impregnable fortress, we shall open a broad struggle against both camps of enslavers, the Capitalists and the bureaucratic betrayers and usurpers of the October Revolution. Stand up for the emancipation of the world working class, for terminating the war-breeding division of humanity into national States, for ending the subjection of the woman, for organizing one international democratic workers' State, for starting the construction of the authentic Socialist society!

#### A Would-be Appeal to the Polish Soldiers in Czechoslovakia

Polish soldiers, look whom Gomulka and his generals support! Do you recall from your history books the terrible butchery of the Polish population of Praga, a suburb of Warsaw, by the infamous Russian mass murderer, Catherine's Field-Marshal Suvorov? He suppressed the struggle for independence of Poland with such a frightful ferocity that the account of that savage massacre almost defies belief.

Mention of this monstrous crime can be found in the early "Soviet" publications. Thus, in the First Edition of the *Bolshaia Sovetskaiia Encyclopedia*, in the entry "Warsaw," Suvorov's name as the commander of the Russian army is openly stated—"in November 1794, with the arrival of the Russian troops under the command of Suvorov who took the suburb of Warsaw, Praga, after a bloody storm and butchery (killed were 23,000 people) . . . (1928, Vol. IX, p. 33).

However, as the Great-Russian chauvinist virus seeped deeper and deeper into the bureaucratic ideology, the name of Suvorov in connection with his butchery of the masses of Praga is withheld. In the Second Edition of the *Bolshaia Sovetskaiia Encyclopedia* in the entry "Warsaw" the name of this mass murderer is omitted (1951, Vol. VII, p. 15).

The name of Suvorov has been enveloped by the Kremlin leaders of the Communist Party with an aura of respect, even of profound veneration. In the soul of every high "Soviet" bureaucrat the mention of the name of this terrible butcher arouses an emotional storm of affection. The "Soviet" War Ministry published a work *A. V. Suvorov* (Moscow 1951) in which the following is stated: "In the brilliant pleiades of national heroes, of whom our people are proud, Suvorov's name is in the front ranks. We revere his memory as of an outstanding representative of the Russian people, as an ardent patriot, as the greatest Russian military leader." (p. 3). Even in stronger emotional terms writes Marshal of the USSR, V. Sokolovsky: "We revere Suvorov as one of the most courageous representatives of our forebears, as a great Russian military leader, as our national military glory." (p. 25).

Polish soldiers: View the political nature of the Great-Russian Government of the USSR and of its lackey Gomulka leadership of Poland in the gory light of the twenty-three thousand men, women and children of Praga, mostly workers and their families, whose bodies lay in pools of their blood spilled early in November 1794 by the hideous aristocrat-murderer, Alexander Vasilievich Suvorov!

Polish soldiers! The hard physical reality of the old Poland under the military boots of the Tsars and their generals was Russification. Polish students and workers were harshly treated; Polish boys were inducted into the Russian Army to fight for the Tsar. But hope never perished to throw off the Tsarist oppression.

Contemporary Poland wears a cloak of independence, but in political, economic and military reality it is a dependency of Moscow. Gomulka, at the command of the "Soviet" generals, brought you to Czechoslovakia. Have you ever looked at the gorgeous tunics of the Russian Commanders? You will note numerous orders they proudly wear in grand manner on their puffed-up chests. Of course there is the order of Lenin. But look closely at row after row. You will come soon upon the *Order of Suvorov*. To those who are not familiar with the biography of Suvorov, the wearing of his image by the "Soviet" general and officials has no special negative significance. Khrushchev had reached a wide and ostensibly popular reception in "Socialist" Poland. But no one apparently detected on his chest two medals of the *Order of Suvorov*, the butcher of the Polish people in Tsarist Days. Look at the photograph of Vasilevsky. You will find on his chest medals of the order of Suvorov. But Suvorov is not the only bloody hangman whose memory is cherished by the "Soviet" bureaucracy. The Kremlin rulers hold in a very high esteem Bogdan Khmelnitsky. You will find many "Soviet" officers decorated with his order. Who was that man? He was a Ukrainian Cossack landlord. He suppressed with ferocity, the Ukrainian peasants who rose in rebellion against serfdom. He butchered Polish masses. For the Jews he was the Hitler of the Seventeenth Century, putting to death hundreds of thousands of them through a wide variety of frightful tortures. Why did Stalin, Khrushchev, Brezhnev-Kosygin, and other Moscow dictators, bestow a great honor upon the dark and

bloody memory of that man? There is only one reason, he sold the Ukraine to the Tsar.

Polish soldiers, wake up! You have been ordered to join in the military occupation of Czechoslovakia to save the hold upon it by the Moscow glorifiers of some of the worst Tsarist bandits, even of the Tsar Ivan IV, the Terrible!

With your help, furnished by Gomulka to the usurpers in the Kremlin, they sustain their Great-Russian chauvinist super-ego. Visualize what would happen to the Polish toiling masses today if they attempted to oppose the servility of the Gomulka regime to the new "Tsars," who reside in the Tsar's palace in the Kremlin, if a separate, isolated, purely national movement were launched in Poland to liberate the masses from the Russian and their own Polish bureaucratic oppressors. Recall to mind the Great-Russian national "hero" and "glory," the upholder of serfdom, loyal flunkey of Catherine the "Great," Alexander Vasilievitch Suvorov! "Praga" would have been attempted by Brezhnev-Kosygin on a monstrous scale. Only fraternization with the Russian soldiers in Poland could make that country safe from attack.

Don't let your generals who serve your *actual* masters sitting in the Kremlin, to send you back to Poland. Free yourselves and eventually the Polish working class, from the domination of the Moscow usurpers and your own Polish bureaucrats, who are but cringing lackeys, years ago of Stalin, then of Khrushchev, and now of Brezhnev-Kosygin. Dismiss Gomulka's generals and elect officers of your own choice. Stay in Czechoslovakia as free, revolutionary soldiers, free as were the soldiers of the Petrograd garrison in 1917—until, after October, they fell into the bureaucratic clutches of Trotsky who demobilized the historical garrison and recruited them into the so-called "Workers and Peasants Red Army" to serve the interests of the bureaucracy. He then without difficulty disposed of the elected officers, killed the elective principle for the armed forces he himself had strongly advocated only a few months earlier. Trotsky staffed the command of the Red Army not with capable soldiers—Communists but with ex-Tsarist generals appointed by him personally. Here in Czechoslovakia you will be safe from the enemies of the toiling masses, the Moscow bureaucrats and the Washington imperialists. Fraternize with your class brothers, the Russian soldiers, from whom you are now kept apart, and reach with them an agreement to throw off all bureaucrats, to make Czechoslovakia a fortress of the authentic Socialist liberation of the toiling masses. Unite with the Russian and all other soldiers of the occupation armies and with the soldiers of the occupied Czechoslovakia. Bring back to the attention of the workers the unfulfilled program of the Bolsheviks of 1917, supplement it with the positions that would end all oppression and slavery. Let us electrify the workers with the declaration of their emancipation from hiring servitude. Let us arm the entire population of Czechoslovakia, in contrast to the military system in the "Socialist" and in the Capitalist countries where the masses are deliberately kept disarmed. Let the world see the beginning of the authentic Socialist revolution—against the oppressors in the East and against the oppressors in the West.

### Post Stalin Stalinism

Under Stalin's "Dictatorship of the Proletariat" the USSR was a huge prison covering one sixth of the earth's surface, from west of the Danube stretching eastward for thousands of miles to the Bering Strait, a short distance from Alaska. When he died a great wave of relief swept over the USSR. Three years later Khrushchev's famous de-Stalinization speech (1956) was followed by a period of enthusiastic smashing of Stalin's statues, the glad renaming of towns, of streets, the incisive clearing of the atmosphere of Stalinist lies, of abuse of personal power, the return of framed prisoners from labor camps, a period exciting hopes of the end of the practice of bodysnatching and assassinations. Coming out of the dark cellar into the imaginary spring sunshine, the masses, the writers and the scientists, began to catch a glimpse of freedom, to think and to speak. But, many skeptical people said, it is too good to last. And they were right. Oppression by degrees returned. Then came the usurpation of power by Brezhnev and Kosygin. Imperceptibly, a process set in of reintroduction of Stalinist repression of intellect. The death notice of the short-lived and, by the standards of 1917, extremely limited freedom of expression was served upon the population of the USSR by Brezhnev-Kosygin through the savage "trial" and monstrous torment of hard labor imprisonment inflicted upon two writers, Daniel and Sinyavsky.

And presently, the memory of the grim years of "Dictatorship of the Proletariat" when people were excommunicated from friends and relatives, when intellectuals were morally vivisected or physically put to death by Stalin's hangmen, came back to the long-suffering "Soviet" population. The little group which dared to disapprove the Brezhnev-Kosygin thrust of a mighty military fist into the face of Czechoslovak people was brought to "trial." The protesters were given various terms of imprisonment. One of them, Vadim Delone, a student and poet, sentenced to nearly three years in a hard-labor prison, was reported to have made an amazing statement. "For three minutes on Red square I felt free," Mr. Delone told the court in his final statement this morning. "I am glad to take your three years for that." (*The New York Times*, Oct. 12, 1968)

### The Trotskyite "Analysis" of Events in Czechoslovakia and the Indelible Memory of Trotsky's Bloody Suppression of the Kronstadt Rebellion

"The Czechoslovak people had made big strides in reestablishing the norms of Socialist democracy, such as existed in the Soviet Union in the days of Lenin and Trotsky. The logic of this movement was not toward Capitalism, but toward a political revolution against bureaucratic misrule and the establishment of real workers' democracy. That is what the Soviet bureaucrats feared and moved to stop at all costs." (*Militant*, Sept. 6, 1968)

This citation is a bundle of false statements. The leadership of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia by sheer political utopia and fractional requirement allowed Social Democracy to seek its day in the court of the toiling masses, to the soft background music of Washington imperialism. In the days of the "Old Left" it was an open secret that Social Democracy is an agency of Capitalism. Czechoslovakia, before the entry of Brezhnev's troops, was moving, and not with big strides, but with a

limping step, away from grasping claws of Moscow toward the clutching talons of Washington. But the obvious brazen Trotskyist lie, obvious of course only to those who have made a survey of the development of the bureaucratic order in USSR, is the assertion that Socialist democracy existed at all stages of the Lenin-Trotsky regime, or even in the first period of the Bolshevik State. The facts are, there were individual dictators over various branches of industry as early as March 26, 1918 (The Railroad Decree). Long before the first anniversary of the October Revolution, Trotsky was military dictator over much of the "Soviet" territory. Stalin had been appointed an all around dictator over entire South Russia (Decree of May 31, 1918). Stalin informed the regional leadership under him that he had been "granted unlimited power." (*Documents on the History of the Civil War in USSR*, Rus. p. 152). With every month, every week, every day, the Bolshevik State under Lenin and Trotsky was becoming more and more bureaucratized. And perhaps no documents are more glaringly revealing of that fact than the stenographic records of the Bolshevik Party Congresses. Because they were printed in very limited editions, not even the average bureaucrat in Russia was able to obtain them.

One need not have a special talent for finding in these documents testimony of bureaucratic transformation of the Bolshevik leadership. At the Eighth Party Congress (March 18-23, 1919) the following remarkable, historically verified observation was made: "Our Party comrades have become bureaucrats and are separating themselves from the masses." (*Sten. Rep.*, Rus. p. 182)

One of these transformed comrades was, of course, Trotsky. It is enough to read his crass bureaucratic speeches to recognize that a sharp change occurred in the man since he acquired personal power. Thus, "not all Soviet workers have understood that our administration has been centralized and that all orders from above must be final." He followed this indication of the anti-1917 attitude toward the people standing below him in rank with a dictatorial warning: "We shall be pitiless with those Soviet workers who have not yet understood; we will remove them, cast them out of our ranks, pull them up with repressions."

Trotsky cited these arrogant remarks from his speech he delivered at the Sixth Congress of Soviets, on November 9, 1918, in his work *Stalin*, (p. 291), shortly before he was felled by a Stalinist assassin. The threat, he says, "was aimed at Stalin." Is this assertion true? Or is it in line with the massive fabricated story that Trotsky fought Stalinism, according to him, already back in 1918! In the light of the fact that Stalin was no "Soviet worker" but a top commissar-dictator, stepping, as did Trotsky, quite heavily upon the workers and upon subordinate bureaucrats, in the name of Socialism, of the fact that two days before, Stalin, for the first, and as history shows, the last time in his life, expressed in *Pravda* an extremely friendly, high praise for Trotsky's part in winning over just before October the Petrograd garrison to the Bolsheviks, the story that his arrogant threat "was aimed at Stalin" is a piece of deceit.

In March 1921, during the Tenth Party Congress, which issued an order dissolving the groups opposing or criticizing the policy of the Central Committee of the Party—"non-compliance with this order of the Congress must involve unconditional and immediate expulsion from the Party"—occurred the mutiny of the sailors in the Bolshevik fortress of

Kronstadt. A few days before, on February 28, 1921, Lenin acknowledged: "Of course, within our apparatus there is much imperfection, vileness, because much bureaucratism has penetrated into it, much too much." (*Collected Works*, Rus. XXVI, 183). This admission was made by him two years after the following statement was printed in the Party press: "Everybody knows that into all our Soviet institutions have crept a tremendous number of all sorts of scoundrels and rogues." (*Krasnaya Gazeta*, Feb. 7, 1919)

Why did the sailors rebel? Could one in honesty charge that they, surveying the development since the October Revolution, decided that this was Socialism, so contrary to the stirring ideas of 1917, and agreed among themselves to bring Capitalism back? The compelling motive in their opposition to the policies of the Lenin-Trotsky regime was the harsh fact of bureaucratic corruption growing hourly before their eyes. The worst feature was that nothing was being done by the top leadership to curb this disease. Of this they were convinced, for already two years back the following statement had been made public in the Bolshevik press: "We all complain about the plethora of hooligans and scoundrels in our ranks, but we do nothing to get rid of this filth." (Ib.)

Trotsky, as the chief of all the armed forces of the State, was directly and immediately involved in dealing with the Kronstadt situation. He investigated the proportion of the sailors taking part in the mutiny, as recorded in the *Stenographic Report of the Congress*: "Of our Kronstadt Comrades-Communists, according to Comrade Trotsky, about 30% are taking an active part against us, about 40% are neutral, and only the rest are fighting against the Kronstadt mutineers." (p. 137)

According to my investigation no such division as reported by Trotsky existed in the ranks of the Kronstadt sailors. Virtually all of them had been in an anti-bureaucratic mood for a long time, and particularly against Trotsky's oppression. Two years before, the most democratic organization in the Bolshevik State was the Baltic Fleet. Then, in February 1919, "By the order of the Revolutionary Soviet of the Republic to the Baltic Fleet the ship committees are abolished. In their stead Commissars are appointed to the ships." (*Krasnaya Gazeta*, Feb. 8, 1919). Trotsky was a top member of the Revolutionary Soviet. Just about that time people all over the country read in *Pravda* about "bureaucratism which has entangled all of Soviet Russia" (Feb. 18, 1919). It deeply entangled now, by Trotsky's order, the Baltic Fleet.

The sailors were fed up with the bureaucratic development. They said so during the mutiny in their radio address "Slooshai, Trotsky!—Listen, Trotsky!"

Many years later, Max Shachtman, with crocodile tears dripping on his paper, wrote, "The suppression of the Kronstadt rising was one of the saddest necessities of the Russian Revolution." (*Stalin School of Falseification*, Explanatory Notes, p. 313)

That the composition of the Baltic Fleet personnel had undergone considerable change from that of 1917, by which Trotsky many years later explained the mutiny, is only partly true. Many 1917 sailors were still in Kronstadt, and were very influential with the rest of the personnel. The tradition of the Cruiser *Aurora*, the ship which fired the blanks upon the Winter Palace to frighten Kerensky's ministers into surrender, burned fiercely in the heart of every old and new sailor. Their hatred was now

directed against bureaucratism, against appointed commissars. But in the main, they hated Trotsky, the man whom they had enthusiastically followed during the October Revolution, who had made their blood boil against the traitors Mensheviks and SRs, against the international Social Democracy, Kautsky and others who were giving support to the Kaiser or to the French and British bankers, against Kropotkin and other Anarchist leaders who politically united with the Tsar. They hated Trotsky because he, after securing personal control over the armed forces, was ubiquitous throughout the entire "Soviet" territory concretely proping up bureaucratic oppression, shaking hands with thousands of ex-Tsarist officers, some of whom, *he knew*, had butchered revolutionary peasants and workers before entering Trotsky's service. The sailors hated him because he reneged on all the proletarian-democratic promises of 1917.

When was the starting point of their intense aversion with respect to the organizer of the October Revolution?

Trotsky concealed to the end of his life, evidently even from his close international friends, Cannon and Shachtman, that the October sailors began to hate him as early as Autumn 1918. There had been a mutiny in the Baltic Fleet about a year after the October Revolution. The story was not disclosed for eight years, until a Bolshevik writer, Flerovsky, inadvertently revealed it in a "Soviet" journal: "About the mutiny of the sailors mobilized in the Autumn of 1918 in the Baltic Fleet there is not a single line in our historical-revolutionary literature . . . it was in its social essence a forerunner of the Kronstadt uprising of 1921." (*Proletarskaya Revolutsia*, 1926, VIII, 218)

In the 1921 mutiny the initial outbreak occurred on the battleship *The Marat*. On February 28 the crew held a meeting of protest against bureaucratic abuse of power by the commissars and adopted a resolution criticising the top Bolshevik leadership. Next day the political air in Kronstadt was charged with bitter discontent. The sailors openly voiced their objection to the bureaucratic conduct of the "Soviet" regime. Next day a mass meeting was organized in the central square of Kronstadt with most of the Baltic Fleet sailors present, participated in by a large number of local workers and many Red Army men. The resolution adopted by the meeting, with hardly a dozen hands raised in opposition, clearly heaved to the line of the crew of *The Marat*. Among the demands presented to the Lenin-Trotsky Government were: to allow the Left Socialists and Anarchists to participate in "freely elected Soviets" and to grant "Freedom of speech and press to Anarchists and Left Socialist Parties." The line was not, even in part, an approach to the position of liberation of the working class, of creating the first unit of the world Socialist State, but, quite clearly, of turning the clock back to the pre-October period, a line distinctly favorable to the Mensheviks, SRs and Anarchists, tendencies within the proletariat struggling to restore Capitalist slavery in Russia.

What was Trotsky's response? Back in 1917, some months before the October Revolution, the sailors in the majority followed the Mensheviks, SRs and the Anarchists. Trotsky's brilliant speeches surging with dramatic logic, the arguments of other Bolshevik speakers, all based on the Leninist programmatic pledges of proletarian democracy, of elections of officers from the ranks, promise of workers' control of industry, categorical condemnation of bureaucratism, swept the sailors into the Bolshevik ranks. But in March 1921 similar speeches would have only acceler-

ated their breakaway. If before October in the whole fantastic storm of words of all political tendencies only the Bolshevik promises were permeated with rare fidelity to the interests of the workers, now repetition of these promises would have been obvious lies and hypocrisy. The sailors had seen with their own indignant eyes how the Bolshevik leaders changed into State bureaucrats. Quite logically, Trotsky refused to speak to the sailors, to attempt offering promises, to enter into any discussions with them. In his radio ultimatum demanding their immediate, unconditional surrender Trotsky dishonestly and brazenly slandered them as "White Guard mutineers" (*Izvestia*, March 8, 1921). Ten days later, Trotsky proceeded against them with the force of arms. Significantly, he did not use the Red Army soldiers, who, he reveals in his autobiography, in that period, were in a "Kronstadt" mood too, resentful at being placed under the command of bureaucrats, and primarily on account of the "food tax" levied upon the villages. "The change to the new economic policy went into effect just a year later, unanimously, but to the tune of the rumblings of the Kronstadt rebellion and in the atmosphere of threatening moods in the entire army." (Leon Trotsky, *My Life*, 437). The workers, too, were embittered and angry. Trotsky mentions a rising in the Tambov province (466).

To suppress the sailors Trotsky relied upon *kursanti*, the military students, nearly all sons of bureaucrats and of higher paid workers, and on hundreds of delegates to the Tenth Party Congress, in their majority big and small bureaucrats. Kronstadt was taken by storm, with the sailors not attempting to offer a determined resistance. They had expected a measure of consideration of their past grievances, not a bloody battle. Rounded up, they were thrown into prisons, where many of them died before the rise of Stalin's dictatorship. Those who lived on in prisons were eventually murdered on Stalin's orders. If there were trials, they were held behind the prison walls. However, one of the essential ingredients of discipline in the military forces was *death penalty*. There were rumors that Trotsky executed a number of leading sailors. In 1917 no voice made the appeal to the best side of a human being in condemning the death penalty in the bourgeois army more emphatic than Trotsky's. He had insisted upon constructing the armed forces of the working class upon the principle of persuasion and conviction, and devotion to the ideal of freedom, not on the principle of capital punishment for infraction of bureaucratic rules. Death penalty in the Army and an oppressive regime are inseparable. Who introduced the death penalty in the Red Army? Stalin? Lenin? No. Although they gave support to this measure, they did not initiate it. Speaking in the Bolshevik fraction of the All-Russian Central Council of Trade Unions on January 12, 1920, nearly a year before Kronstadt, Lenin revealed the name of the man: "Comrade Trotsky has introduced the death penalty, and we will support him." During the Civil War a strong "military opposition" inside the Bolshevik Party arose against Trotsky. Quite logically his repressive measures were exercised chiefly against the Communists who resented his turning over of the command of the Red Army to the Tsarist officers.

What should have been the political position of Kronstadt in the historical sense?

The present world, composed of two forms of exploitation, *private* under the bourgeoisie, and *State* under the "Marxist-Leninist" bureaucracy,

forms a vicious circle for all the oppressed. A morbid process is going on of mass turns from pillar to post, first from the Capitalists to the State bureaucrats, and then attempts to escape from the State bureaucrats back to the Capitalists. The Left Socialists, the Anarchists, the Trotskyites, and the "Marxist-Leninist" bureaucrats holding State power, Brezhnev-Mao-Castro-Svoboda-Tito-Gomulka-Ulbricht, and the rest, insofar as the issue of emancipation of the working class is concerned, are all counter-revolutionary. However, in their relations to each other and toward the different systems of oppression, the distinction among them is considerable. The Left Socialists always defend Capitalism. When they began to push themselves to the fore in Czechoslovakia, they were not initiating a struggle for the overthrow of all the exploiters but for inveigling the Czechoslovak masses, via bourgeois democracy, out of the enclosure of one set of oppressors, the "Marxist-Leninist" bureaucrats, back to the Capitalist enslavers. Obscured by shimmering misinterpretations and eloquent confusion is the deep-seated fact that the "Marxist-Leninist" bureaucrats, not one iota less than the Capitalists, are intrinsically military butchers of the workers. Both sets of oppressors, when the resistance to oppression reaches the boiling point and no other means left to subdue the oppressed rely on prisons, bullets, and Fascist or Stalinist terror.

What should have been the *historically* correct position of the sailors of Kronstadt? The answer can be no other than given to the questions, What ought to have been the viewpoint of the advanced workers led by Babouf in the French Revolution? What stand should have Marx and Engels taken in the Revolution of 1848? What triple-tested wrong moves should have been avoided and a clear approach to the hidden by history path toward Socialism made by the Paris Commune of 1871? What should have been the program of the proletarian vanguard in the mass upheaval of 1905-6 led by the united then Bolsheviks and Mensheviks? What vital points were lacking in Lenin's 1917 program?

From their inept, headlong start to their tragic finish in Stalin's prisons, the unforgettable honest sailors, in whose hearts in 1917 burned fiercely the hatred for the bourgeoisie, and after their surrender to Trotsky in 1921 through lingering death, for the "Communist" bureaucracy, their somber minds remained politically blank. They perished, never grasping the *real* tragedy of the world working class, the fact that the transformation of the Bolshevik leaders was caused *in the main* by the principle of hiring human beings, which produces both slaves and masters, that the first prerequisite in the policy of the movement for ending the slavery of the working class is unconditional rupture with any political tendency which accepts this principle as a condition of life within the human species.

Would Trotsky have resorted to bullets had the impossible at that time occurred and the sailors of the Baltic Fleet, instead of heading back to the SRs, Mensheviks and Anarchists, projected a correct line? One cannot say. But this is certain. *The New York Times*, decades later, on the anniversary of the Kronstadt mutiny, would not have memorized the sailors standing on the position that the hiring principle must be abolished in its entire complex spectrum, as fighters for human liberty. In the bourgeois mind, as it was in the mind of the Greek, Roman and other chattel slaveholders, as it was in the mind of the Feudal lords, as in this epoch in the mind of the "Marxist-Leninist" bureaucrats when applied

in their own domain, the principle of hiring men and women is synonymous with freedom.

### The Trotsky Leaders Unfold Their Line for Czechoslovakia

**S**plashing "workers democracy" paint over Czechoslovak bureaucratic society, the Trotsky leadership assumed the role of "redwashing" the Dubcek-Svoboda-Cernik lackeys of Moscow. These bureaucrats, thus far in power by Moscow's cautious tolerance, did not require anyone to tell them that with the further expansion of "Liberalization" the Socialists, operating in free competition for the control of the State, might have won the majority of the population. The ousting of the Dubcek regime would then have followed. On the other hand, with Brezhnev's generals in control, Czechoslovak "Communist" lackeys of Moscow had a chance, and probably received a solemn promise from Brezhnev to that effect, to remain as the "rulers" of the Czechoslovak State. Therefore the Dubcek-Svoboda-Cernik group listened very attentively to the opinion and "advice" given by Moscow. The Trotsky leaders pictured this group as heading the opinion of the *working class* of Czechoslovakia!

"The Fourth International demands the immediate liberation of Dubcek, of Cisar, of Smrkovsky, of all the Czechoslovak Communist leaders, journalists, intellectuals, and militants who have been arrested. Woe to the henchmen of the Soviet bureaucracy who imprison Communists whose only crime is that they took into account the opinion of the workers of their country." (*Militant*, Sept. 6, 1968)

How much truth is there in the assertion that there was "the opinion of the workers" of Czechoslovakia, and that the "Communists" paid attention to that "opinion"?

Many of the Trotsky leaders have done and are doing extensive reading. From the numerous debates among the Socialist scholars of the Nineteenth Century, and in all the Internationals, they have learned that such remarks as taking into account the opinion of the workers, or "respect for world opinion," are mostly phrases designed to create the impression that the vast masses are guided by opinions of their own, carry an ideology forged by their own smiths. For centuries "the opinion of the workers" was shaped by the Feudal Church, by the kings and lords of the realm. After Capitalism arose, "the opinion of the workers" was built by the "public," a euphemism for the leading bankers, manufacturers, and by statesmen and intellectuals serving the Capitalists.

When Lenin in 1917 brought with him his opinion embodied in the *April Theses*, he spoke out against "the opinion of the workers"—using a kind of language to which the workers responded—because "their" opinion was, support to the Provisional Government of the Capitalists, fabricated for the masses by the Mensheviks and SRs. Neither did he in 1917 "take into account" the chauvinistic "opinion of the workers" of Germany, France, England and other warring powers. He presented his opinion, and proceeded to dislodge from the mind of the Russian masses the opinion of the Mensheviks and SRs, also of the Anarchists, who, while favoring the overthrow of the bourgeois State, were opposed on principle to creating a workers' State. The unspoken tug-of-war among the political guiding individuals implied: if Lenin's opinion became the opinion of the masses, the bourgeoisie would be overthrown; if the Menshevik-SR opinion was retained by the masses, the bourgeoisie would be saved.

How was the opinion of the workers shaped in the Communist International, presided over by Zinoviev, its first chairman and in 1922 Stalin's partner in conspiring against Lenin? The influx of Tsarist and bourgeois riff-raff into the Bolshevik Party and into the "Soviet" State could not but affect the leading cadres of the Communist Parties all over the Capitalist world. Thousands, tens of thousands, of able, even talented, even brilliant with the pen and tongue, rogues and intellectual soldiers of fortune, and not a few asses in lion's skin who learned by rut Leninist revolutionary language, poured into these organizations and almost overnight elbowed their way to the very upper tiers of leadership. Not one of these intellectually dishonest people reacted in a wholesome fashion to such report, appearing in the "Soviet" press, as, "much rottenness has accumulated in our Soviet State. It does not correspond to that concept which we had when we began building the Soviet power." (*Pravda*, April 16, 1921)

In the web of factional intrigues for power the Lovestones, Fosters, Browders, Brandlers, Thorezes, with alacrity accepted Zinoviev's line to whip up an attack upon Trotsky in the Communist International. With a remarkable gift for creating "the workers opinion," Zinoviev, when suddenly set upon by perfidious Stalin, turned to Trotsky for a factional deal to meet the terrifying prospect of living in a tiger's den. Zinoviev made a desperate mention in public of Lenin's "Will," introducing an entirely new lie about its contents; "Lenin in his 'Will' pointed out the shortcomings of every one of us, but he bade us to work together." (Zinoviev, *Pravda*, Nov. 2, 1927)

Trotsky saw that Zinoviev, now his, not Stalin's partner, told an atrocious lie to the workers, as criminal as Trotsky's hypocritical statement two-and-a-half years earlier, "Comrade Lenin has not left any 'Will.'" Leaning heavily on this new lie with respect to the Testament, Trotsky attempted to shape the opinion of the "Soviet" workers that they support "Lenin's line" as presented by the Opposition. He instructed his followers, mostly young boys and girls, to enter the Stalinist parade celebrating the tenth anniversary of October, with placards: "For the Unity of the Party of Lenin!"—the obvious implication for unity with Stalin—and the most sordid of all the inscriptions, a prime example of the multifaceted decay of the intellect of the former sterling revolutionists, a *plea to Stalin*, "Fulfil Lenin's Testament!"

The Stalin faction took "into account the opinion of the workers" and booted Trotsky and his systematically misled followers out of the Bolshevik Party—into prisons, murdering them, over the next fifteen years, in the hundreds of thousands by various methods of torture, ending with the assassination of the master-mind of frustrated loyalty to Stalin, the former great revolutionist, Leon Trotsky.

How much deception, gyrations of conscience, hypocrisy, criminal twisting of "the opinion of the workers" took place around the Testament can be gathered yet from another revealing fact. While Zinoviev through *Pravda* was desperately lying to the masses that Lenin had expressed the desire that all the leaders worked harmoniously together, the rank and file members of the Opposition, who by now knew that Lenin urged the removal of Stalin, were handed out for distribution copies of the Testament, mutilated by Trotsky to cover up his allies, Zinoviev and Kamenev. Trotsky redesigned the contents of the Testament by omitting Lenin's

reminder regarding their stand in 1917 against the line toward the October Revolution. (Noted in *Pravda*, Nov. 27, 1927)

After Stalin's death his vast "Marxist-Leninist" territorial possessions, in essence like the Empire of Alexander, who was the most powerful enslaver in the pre-Roman world, was torn apart by his heirs. The "opinion of the workers" in China became that of Mao Tse-tung, who teaches his slaves to regard Stalin with profound esteem. In Russia a new "opinion of the workers" was developed by Krushchev, splendidly decorated with de-Stalinization. The leaders of the Moscow-oriented Communist Parties, churned out a Khrushchev "opinion of the workers" denouncing Stalin. Later, with amazing skill of perversion of history for their base ends, they formed the "opinion of the workers" in support of Brezhnev-Kosygin who usurped power from Khrushchev.

So, when the Trotskyist Fourth International conjures up an "opinion of the workers" in Dubcek's Czechoslovakia, it adds to its vast store of fabrications and political inventions another piece of heinous fiction, as all the other pieces damaging to the workers' cause.

The "treasure-trove" of delusions and outright deceptions quite successfully injected by various schools of treason to Socialism into the mind of the world vanguard of the working class does not have much room for giving a comprehensive review of the extremely rare occasions in history when the masses momentarily expressed their own opinion. One of these occasions was the peasant revolt against the French nobility in 1358, known as the Jacquerie. In modern times, the demonstration of the working girls in Petrograd on March 8, 1917, against the war and the Capitalist-imposed mass hunger, was the expression of their own opinion. Acting in defiance of "opinion of the workers," of the Tsar, of his Church, his generals, of the bourgeoisie, paying no heed to the leaders of the secret organization of the Left Mensheviks, SRs and of the Bolsheviks, who counselled against street demonstrations on that particular day, the stout-hearted working girls marched into the open, and braving the police, the soldiers, and even the Cossacks who had been, as a rule, loyal to the Tsar, demanded peace and bread. The girls were immediately joined by men-workers. The troops refused to obey their officers' command to fire, and joined the demonstration. Petrograd for two full days was in the independent hands of the workers and soldiers. On the third day a new "opinion of the workers" was formed by the Petrograd Soviet under the Mensheviks and the SRs who tied the masses to the bourgeoisie.

The most recent expression of really independent opinion of the workers took place in the May 1968 France. But to say, as the Trotsky leadership does, that the Czechoslovak workers had an independent opinion in 1968, and that the Dubcek-Svoboda-Cernik bureaucrats took it "into account" is again to distort facts of history.

### High Life

What was the Czechoslovakia of the upper stratum of the bourgeoisie in the days of Masaryk and Benes? How did the Czech Capitalists and the Nazi officers amuse themselves in Prague under Hitler? What was the Prague of the top Czech bureaucrats under Stalin's henchmen, Gottwald and Novotny, and during the "Liberalization" period? To answer these questions is to tell what is the Paris, and the New York, the other centers of the financial tycoons, of steel magnates, oil kings, of the elite of the

bourgeoisie in general, where the men of fabulous opulence feast on gastronomic luxuries and are entertained by plush-hotel prostitutes. To answer more of these questions is to draw the "socialist" curtains apart and show the high life of the Moscow aristocracy of the bureaucracy, the magnificent "proletarian" dinner parties with plenty of caviar and vodka, often attended by foreign diplomats, heads of corporations from America and other Capitalist countries, striking up commercial and political deals, graced by the presence of "Soviet" and bourgeois ladies bedecked with gold and jewels.

In "Socialist" Prague, there are places of untrammelled atmosphere of "wine, women and song," with "call girls" and other features of bourgeois and "Socialist" bureaucratic entertainment. Having flourished during the "Liberalization" period, which the Trotskyites described as a movement "toward a political revolution against bureaucratic misrule," the fashionable clubs, hotels and bars in Prague received a setback in business at the time the occupation army entered the city. But barely a month passed when the bureaucratic debauch made a slow return to normalcy. "Night life has returned to this beleaguered city . . ." says a dispatch from Prague (N.Y.T., Sept. 17, 1968) "At night spots with names like Bibita, Lucerne, Esplanade Bar, Jalta Bar and Tatran Bar, Englishmen and Germans drink Scotch whiskey at two dollars a shot. . . . In the cavernous cellar premises of the Lucerne Bar, which before the invasion provided the first striptease in recent Prague history, a six-piece orchestra plays Latin-American rhythms." The "recent Prague history" is of course the debauch during Dubcek's "Liberalization." Prostitutes of the "Socialist" center are there, of course, waiting for customers, and "Socialist" waiters sigh for the good bar-hopping nights of the recent past: "The call girls, staring blankly, sit on stools, and a headwaiter at one of the nightclubs, mindful of the Soviet tanks that still ring the city, comments, 'It will never be the same again'!"

The correspondents visiting this den of corruption should have assured him that with respect to "High life" it would be basically the same under the guns of the Russian tanks as under Dubcek's "Liberalization," perhaps even more interesting for the bureaucrats, as in the USSR, where, according to the "Soviet" magazine *Trud*, prostitution is quite visibly meandering through the beautiful vistas of "Socialist" Moscow.

#### **Reactionary Aspects of the "Withdrawal of Troops" Line**

The Trotskyist Fourth International issued a Manifesto on the invasion of Czechoslovakia. Did this document offer a revolutionary line for the workers, for the occupation troops? It said: "The Fourth International appeals to the Soviet, Polish, Hungarian, Bulgarian and East German troops to immediately leave the territory of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, as the Czechoslovak working masses ask them to do." (*Militant*, Sept. 6, 1968)

What are the aspects of political reality of this line? Clearly, it is not a call to the soldiers for revolutionary fraternization, for the removal of Brezhnev's generals, for revolution against the Moscow oppressors, for the exposure of the Dubcek-Svoboda lackeys of Moscow. The Trotskyist line is for the Russian troops to go back to Russia as *slaves of the bureaucracy*. Brezhnev himself would adopt eventually this policy. In fact, the Krem-

lin's generals began to withdraw Russian, Polish and other units from Czechoslovakia two months after the invasion. The ruling usurpers in Moscow, to strengthen their dictatorial position, organized a turbulent welcome for their returning soldiers after the units had crossed Poland into the USSR; "From the Polish-Soviet border there were outpourings of the traditional bread and salt of welcome, apples and doughnuts. The soldiers and their vehicles were decorated with flowers . . . At the welcome home meeting Nikolas S. Konovalov, the First Secretary of the Party in the province, declared, 'When we saw you off, we were sure you would fulfil your mission with honor . . . You have justified our confidence.' (N.Y.T. Oct. 25, 1968)

Thus in the bracket of forty-five years, between 1923 and 1968, the heads of the Trotskyist movement have been tailoring their line in such fashion that it would be always aiding both the Stalinist bureaucracy and the bourgeoisie, sometimes consciously tipping the scale heavily in favor of Stalin, as in the case of Trotsky's lying that Lenin left no Testament to remove Stalin from power, sometimes consciously in favor of the Capitalists, as in the case of Spain

Since a correct policy can be no other than one aimed at the breaking of the very bone structure of the Capitalist and of the Stalinist powers, a word of criticism must be offered on the policy of the handful of the courageous protesters in Moscow who raised the slogan for independence of Czechoslovakia. This line is contrary to the idea of establishing one world Socialist State. It is a position of fragmentation of the species into national segments, at bottom hostile to one another, wearing ideological suits of mail to protect the interests of the Capitalist and the Stalinist vultures gnawing at the entrails of the toiling humanity.

With their politically clouded minds, the seven protesters in the Red Square in Moscow could not devise the correct line on Czechoslovakia, or present a vision of authentic Socialism. Living in vast territorial prison of the neo-Stalinist usurpers, these intrepid individuals should have applied extremely skillful, indirect tactic to hit the top Kremlin bureaucrats. They should have leaned heavily on the numerous Bolshevik declarations in 1917 against the bureaucratic plague. In the Red Square, and at the "trial" which followed, they should have made every effort to demonstrate that the present Czechoslovak State was founded by the arch-bureaucrat Stalin, that his henchman Gottwald built a durable nest of bureaucratic oppressors, that under Dubcek's "Liberalization," the political forces uncompromisingly hostile to the Bolshevik ideas of 1917 were pulling Czechoslovakia toward the Washington sphere of influence, and that, since the Russian soldiers are already there, their mission should be to free the workers from the bureaucracy, to block the path back to Capitalism by putting into effect the proletarian-democratic features enunciated by Lenin in 1917. The protesters should have referred to Lenin's 1917 statements that only under a Soviet structure can a Socialist State be built. They should have declared: Let the Russian soldiers in Czechoslovakia initiate the move to build Soviets based on elections in the shops and factories, among the occupation forces themselves, with full freedom for everybody to participate who accepts the position for the abolition of the practice of hiring human beings, and with absolute exclusion from elections of any Party which upholds this practice.

A mimeographed, a typed, or even a handwritten leaflet incorporating

these ideas should have been prepared and distributed, as secretly as possible, among the "Soviet" workers. The illegal leaflet should have carried the slogan "When people are hired, they are not free, whether the hiring is done by a Capitalist or a State bureaucrat!"

Such stand would be eyed by the mailfisted dictators in the Kremlin with a nauseous feeling because of the aspect of a threat to dislodge them from power and fulfil the 1917 program of workers' democracy. Unfortunately, the line of Red Square protesters, as well as of the masses of Czechoslovakia, ran not counter but in the same direction as Brezhnev's, causing him no uneasiness whatsoever, because his soldiers in Czechoslovakia were receiving assurances from their commanders daily that orders from Moscow to withdraw this or that unit were expected momentarily, and certain units were actually returned to Russia. They marched out in full obedience to the masters of Suvorovite discipline, and Kremlin generals.

### Gus Hall "Explains" Brezhnev's Military Dictatorship in Czechoslovakia

When the news of occupation of Czechoslovakia by Brezhnev's military machine burst upon the astounded world, the move was met with widespread disapproval in the "Communist" world. The workers inside the Left movement were profoundly startled. Incomprehensible as the situation seemed, they *felt* a disquieting implication that the working class of Czechoslovakia, after nearly a quarter century of Moscow's guidance, indicated that its mind was ominously open to anti-Communist moods. The immense spectacle of display of the military force which bore down upon the masses and the intellectuals of that minor "Socialist" State, Brezhnev's threat to mow down the Czechlovak workers and students with artillery, to pulverize their ranks if they attempted serious resistance to his army, was too vivid and therefore too shocking to overlook.

In the first few days after the "Soviet" tanks menacingly rolled through the streets of Prague, I spoke to some workers-members of the Communist Party headed by Gus Hall. Visibly bewildered, under the impact, not so much of the general bourgeois condemnation of the "Soviet" ruthless military violation of self-determination of the Czechoslovak "nation," as of the criticism by the largest Communist Parties in the Capitalist world, the Italian and the French, these honest people expressed doubt as to the "correctness" of Brezhnev's policy. Of course, the threat of force *against the workers*, no matter by whom, is no beautiful melody of Socialist democracy but the awesome thump of a military drum presaging proletarian corpses in the streets and streams of blood running down into the sewers. Such was Khrushchev's machine-gun "music" played against the workers in Budapest when the Hungarian masses, unspeakably deceived by the "Communist" bureaucrats, by the glorious false facade of "Socialism" in USSR, turned for leadership to Cardinal Mindszenti and Fascist officers.

In the Communist Party of the United States a discussion among the leaders regarding Brezhnev's policy in Czechoslovakia became known to the membership while the military action was unfolding. The Secretariat, headed by Gus Hall, immediately, unhesitatingly, approved the employment of force by Brezhnev. On August 31-September 2, 1968 Gus Hall presented a report to the National Committee of the Communist Party, later

published as a pamphlet under the heading *Czechoslovakia at the Crossroads*.

Hall admitted that "some members of our National Committee have broken ranks and issued statements to the capitalist press breaking with the position of the Secretariat. We said we did not have enough information to know whether there were other alternatives." (3)

Didn't Hall know from the Hungarian experience that when the masses and the honest intellectuals in a "Socialist" country awaken from the hypnotic, skillfully administered narcotic labelled "Socialism" just as the masses in Capitalist democracy when shaking off the mesmerizing "free world" and "great society" rhetoric, the bureaucrats have no alternative but the application of military force?

In his presentation, Hall bombarded the opposition leaders with the facts of sympathetic attitude of the Capitalist world to the Czechoslovak elements the Russians came to suppress. Since there could be no controversy that the Capitalists are enemies of Socialism, Hall, authoritatively, made it to mean that the "Marxist-Leninist" enemy of the Capitalists represented Socialism!

Gus Hall singled out for castigation a "2,000 Words" statement by 70 Czech intellectuals who, while unwittingly retreating toward Capitalist democracy and eventual subservience to Wall Street imperialism, had faced the leaders of the Communist Party with some razor-sharp criticism. He read from their statement: 'The Communist Party betrayed the great trust the people put in it after the war. It preferred the glories of office until it had those and nothing more. The leadership of the Party changed it from a political and ideological group into a power-hungry organization, attracting egoists, cowards and crooks'. (p. 14)

Now let us read what Gus Hall himself said about the Czechoslovak Communist Party: "As I discussed earlier, in Czechoslovakia there were violations of democratic procedure within the Party and, also, there were violations of legality in regard to the persons, organizations, institutions, etc. These were due to bureaucratic methods of work, a tendency of the Party to replace the state organization to an unwillingness of the leadership to correct these abuses of power and to apply new forms in the economic and political life of the country." (p. 27)

What Gus Hall says here is identical in meaning with what he read from the "2,000 Words" document. This is virtually the language of revolution, used in the interests of "Marxists-Leninist" counterrevolution!

Did Gus Hall ever, at any time previously, show that the Novotny leadership of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia had been a bureaucratic violator of persons and organizations? Never! If anything he had given the Novotny, and later the Dubcek-Svoboda, cliques obvious support.

When bourgeois economists, politicians and journalists discuss labor conditions in Capitalist countries they usually mention "wages," the *hiring pay* to the slaves of Capitalism. There is no blinking the fairly visible fact that their society is divided into "labor and Management," into Capitalists and workers. How "different" is it under the "Socialism" of Dubcek-Svoboda, where the private owners were eliminated many years ago? Gus Hall follows Marx right or wrong, usually wrong insofar as the cause of emancipation of the proletariat is concerned. Gus Hall knows that Marx in *Value, Price and Profit* synonymized: "The final emancipation of the working class, that is to say, the ultimate abolition of the

wages system." But Gus Hall applies Marx's formula, as do all the "Marxist-Leninist" traitors, only to the world where the hirers are private owners of economy. Gus Hall undoubtedly read Marx's recognition of "the general servitude involved in the wages system." (Ib.) But the bureaucratic deception that State economy, which is run on the basis of the "wages system" as private economy, constitutes the liberation of the working class, has been sunk so deep into the mind of trustful Communist workers, that Gus Hall feels perfectly free to talk the identical language of the bourgeoisie in relation to the hiring condition of the workers in "Socialist" countries:

"After 1948 Czechoslovakia had a period of unprecedented economic growth. From 1948 to 1965 their industry had a five fold increase. Wages of industrial workers increased 127%."

"The annual wage increases for all workers served as a material incentive."

"There is a limit, however, to this type of expansion. It is limited by the available labor force."

"It is obvious Czechoslovakia for some time should have had smaller annual wage increases."

"Wages did not decline but the rate of growth did slow down."

"The declining rate in wage increases did not serve as the material incentive." (*Czechoslovakia at the Crossroads*. p. 6)

Gus Hall found, rather pretended to see, among the chief faults in Czechoslovakia not the fact that "Socialism" based on hiring servitude is the taking of the workers for a voyage upon the fog-blanketed sea of deliberate treason to their cause, but in the measure, which remained confined to paper, of equal wages. "More than any other Socialist country Czechoslovakia needed economic reforms. Their equalitarian wage system made a new system of material incentive almost impossible." (p. 5)

And quite unwittingly Gus Hall indicated, by implication of course, that all "Socialist" countries needed democracy! "More than any other Socialist country Czechoslovakia needed democratic reforms."

So! The Czechoslovak workers and intellectuals needed "democratic reforms," and who could supply this need as effectively, with all-persuasiveness, as usurper Brezhnev rolling his tanks through the streets of Prague and other towns, and zooming his warplanes back and forth from one end of the invaded country to another! Several youths, emotionally stirred beyond self-restraint, were brought down by his bullets. As I read in the dispatches from Prague the reports of these crimes, and visualized the forthcoming arrests of workers and intellectuals rejecting the "democratic reforms" of the sort Brezhnev put in operation in the USSR, I thought: Well, at least the dead have been "freed" by Brezhnev from bureaucratic oppression. And suddenly a half-forgotten ditty, which in 1906 the defeated Russian workers were chanting as they were being conveyed by gendarmes to prisons, crossed my mind: "The Tsar got frightened, issued a *Manifest*, freedom for the dead, for the living arrest."

No, the workers of Czechoslovakia and of all other "Socialist" countries, don't need Brezhnev's "democratic reforms"—which are heartily approved by Gus Hall. They need the end of the rule by the gun; they need a ray of sunshine of truth; they, and their Russian, Polish, American, French and other class brothers, need release from hiring servitude, establishment of a cooperative association of emancipated men and wo-

men, a form of society which alone can be designated as Socialism.

What is Gus Hall's political role in the gigantic process of decay of the October leadership? He is not an ace proletarian theoretician, as was Lenin, Bukharin, or Trotsky, before they turned into State bureaucrats. He was not chosen by the rank-and-file of the Communist Party to head the organization. No democratic discussion weighing the qualification of his or other candidates took place. There were no other candidates, just as in the case of Brezhnev's conspiracy for power, except that Hall's eclipse of all other leading figures in the Party was effected by advise from Moscow. He is playing the identical role performed by his predecessors, Browder, Foster, Lovestone. Those were basking in the reflected "glory" of Stalin; Gus Hall luxuriates in the general "warmth" of the present usurper in the Kremlin. But that is not Gus Hall's historical function.

If we learned anything at all from the stupendous betrayal in France, we should recognize that in the most industrialized Capitalist countries the native "Marxist-Leninist" bureaucrats do not dare to overthrow the bourgeoisie, lest they themselves be swept aside by the tide of genuine Socialist democracy. In the darkroom of Hall's mind, by the glow of the red bulb, the negative image of the picture of May 1968 France is sharply clear. A duplication of the May 1968 France on the American scene would involve fifty million workers. The enthusiastic unfolding of a Socialist democracy, the kind that existed only in the constructive hope of the revolutionary workers, sailors and soldiers after the Bolshevik leaders had taken power, would disrespectfully cast Gus Hall into the sewer of history. By the nature of the Stalinist origin of his leadership, Gus Hall and his associates are impelled to be on guard against such eventuality.

The pulse of the leaders of the Communist Party of France might quicken at the hope that one day the Kremlin would bring back the memory of Alexander I of Russia entering Paris after the fall of Napoleon, by rolling its tanks and giant rockets through the streets of the French capital, and place these traitors at the head of "Socialist France." The world is dynamite laden, and no one can categorically exclude this, perhaps remote, possibility, since the USSR today is the strongest military power on the continent of Europe.

But if Gus Hall ever visualized Russian tanks in Union Square, New York, as if the place were Wenceslas Square in Prague, and saw himself "elected" by Stalinist methods to lead the American workers toward "Socialism," his bureaucratic companions would have of course realized that the man's mind cracked up. To cross the Atlantic is not the same as to pass over a bridge spanning the Danube or the Vitava.

There is only one kind of a "revolutionary" line open to a Gus Hall: to carry on the work of his predecessors, Browder, Foster, Lovestone, Wolfe, Gitlow, Weinstone, Trachtenberg, of confusing and "constructively" misleading the Communist workers and intellectuals, to bind them ideologically and politically to the comrades ruling from the Tsar's palace. In continuing to play the general of the army of the workers' revolution in America, Gus Hall, as did his predecessors, picks up the hottest issues of the day. He is mapping out the field-strategy for the Negroes—the Negro question has always been one of the favorite deep-dish pies of the Stalinist bureaucrats—raises his "Socialist" voice against Washington's oppression of the Vietnamese masses, defends the prisoners of

Capitalism—but at the same time sustains hiring servitude, not only in "Socialist" but also in the Capitalist world. Didn't he, together with Dubcek, Svoboda, Gomulka and all the other pro-Kremlin leaders of Communist Parties, make the fullest use of his office to assist his counterparts in France to paralyze and disintegrate the unprecedented dynamic surge of the nearly-emancipated French proletariat in May 1968! Justifying Brezhnev's use of force in Czechoslovakia, Gus Hall concludes his pamphlet: "One must see things as they are and then say it as it is."

Let me then recapitulate on Gus Hall's report on Czechoslovakia by his own dictum of saying "it as it is." Beginning in January-February 1968, and steadily gaining momentum, until stopped by Brezhnev's military seizure of that country, the masses and the intellectuals of Czechoslovakia, unaware of the intrinsic meaning of the development, were gravitating out of the exploitative and oppressive "Socialist" order, heading toward the exploitative and oppressive Capitalist order. But the stupendous surge of ten million workers in the May 1968 France was in its onward rush away from Capitalism, simultaneously breaking with the influence of the "Communist" traitors. It should not be excluded that the workers and the students of France holding on to the occupied industry, expanding the occupation movement, with the guidance offered by clear-minded individuals, might have found their way out of the ideological chaos—if the anti-Capitalist and anti—"Marxist-Leninist" direction were maintained. Perhaps the abolition of hiring human beings was in the offing. Gus Hall, who teaches the workers always to act in "defense of Socialism" (p. 36) lent a willing hand to the leaders of the Communist Party of France through his press. With his aid, to the extent of his influence, they broke the back of the occupation movement and induced the half-emancipated ten million recent slaves of the bourgeoisie to put on anew the old Capitalist hiring yoke of slavery. And to clinch his aid to the French traitors, the Communist Party press was directed by Gus Hall to administer a tonic of "victory" to the troubled mind of the membership which sensed a terrible defeat of the entire French working class. It was beyond the pale of the understanding of the sincere workers and honest intellectuals in and around the Communist Party that the defeat of the French working class was *deliberately* manufactured by the leaders of the Communist Party of France and that Gus Hall fully collaborated with them. Deception, especially in this epoch, moves faster than truth. By now the monstrous betrayal, awash with enormous lies, has been virtually forgotten by most victims.

One of the major and most subtle lies with which Gus Hall "explained" Brezhnev's tiger-leap upon the Czechoslovak masses and intellectuals is his assurance that the presence of the Russian military machine in Czechoslovakia "is not going to destroy Czechoslovakia's sovereignty—it is going to strengthen it." (36)

Moscow's occupation of Czechoslovakia *weakens* the sovereignty not only of that country but of every small Moscow-bound State, and *strengthens* Great-Russian chauvinism. To a hopelessly crippled or paralyzed non-Russian mind in USSR, marked by complete submission to the Kremlin bureaucracy, this fact is accepted without even an inner murmur. But to a thinking worker, who has probably never understood what Socialism is, but who retains the memory of national independence, Polish, Hungarian, Rumanian, Bulgarian, Latvian, Estonian, Lithuanian, Ukrainian — the

Russian military crushing of the Czechoslovak masses and intellectuals was a shock of realization of wearing, in a figurative sense, an iron collar with the inscription, *Servus Servorum Moscow* (Servant of the servants of Moscow).

The program for organizing the international, workers-democratic, bi-sexually-guided State calls for progressive reduction of national sovereignty, but the first step in that direction must be not the crushing of the independence of the little "fishes" like Czechoslovakia or Vietnam, but the smashing of the chauvinism of the giant "sharks," the USSR and the USA.

The official title attached to the person of Gus Hall, a man who never in his traitorous career said "niet" to the tyrants in the Kremlin, a political gambler who always took his chances, first with Stalin, then with Malenkov, later with Khrushchev, and is taking them now with Brezhnev, is "General Secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A." To a person acquainted with the history of the incredible monstrosity known as Stalinism, who is determined to assume the duty of guarding the working class against harboring enemies in its ranks, no designation is as objectionable, horrifying, and clearly identifying its bearer to be a power-engrossed bureaucrat, as the title "General Secretary." It pinpoints a particular stage of treason to the workers. Neither Marx and Engels, nor Lenin, nor any other leader of the Bolshevik Party, had ever thought before 1921 of creating an *administrative* post of "General Secretary" which, automatically, through the technique of arbitrary appointments, invested the man occupying it with a formidable personal power.

Much has been written about Lenin's Testament. But to my knowledge, none of the writers who subjected it to a detailed analysis left momentarily aside the content to point out in criticism that Lenin did not propose to *abolish* this post of concentration of excessive bureaucratic power, but merely to replace Stalin with "another comrade."

In the grimly lurid light of experience, a true revolutionary, while adopting the position of keeping the leaders of the working class from occupying the seats of power, will be particularly on guard against establishing the post of "General Secretary."

#### **International Administration for Every Unit of the International World State**

The World Socialist State cannot be established in one frenzied, simultaneously carried out action. Possibilities for launching the first unit of this State existed in history. Every one of them was disrupted by the leaders-traitors to the working class. If in the next effort, the workers meticulously adhere to the costly lessons of the numerous betrayals of the toiling masses, they may establish the first unit of the authentic Socialist State. In that event they will put into practice a truly internationalist technique of administering it. This must be done in consonance with the internationalist interests of the working class. To offer a theoretical example, if France, or Czechoslovakia, or Russia, China or the United States, be that first unit, it would be placed under the guidance not necessarily of persons born or residing in that country, but of revolutionists drawn both from home and abroad, the principle of keeping the leaders away from posts of power, to prevent their turning into State bureaucrats, being observed. The working class must depart sharply

from the narrow-gauge track of nationalism, which sooner or later turns into ultra-chauvinism, upon which have been running all exploitative States. In the Russian experience, the current impression in 1917 was that the Bolshevik Revolution would initiate authentic internationalism.

Yet, neither the heads of the Bolshevik State, nor the Communist International, ever proposed members of the Communist Parties abroad to leading posts in the "Soviet" Government. The highest administrative body, the Soviet of People's Commissars, by its multi-national composition, gave the impression of being international in character. However, that was so because the former Tzarist Empire was a conglomerate of numerous nationalities. But not a single member of the German, French, or of any other foreign Communist Party was invited into the governing circle of Bolshevik Russia. On the Central Committee of the Party were represented Russians in majority, Ukrainians, Poles, Latvians and others. Conspicuous in the leadership, in striking relative disproportion were Jews, being in their mentality Russian-nationalist. Trotsky, who next to Lenin, occupied the center of the stage in the "Soviet" Government, never in the press acknowledged that he was a Jew. "I am a Russian revolutionist."

Intrinsically, the October Revolution was Russian-nationalist in character. Sooner or later it had to reach the chauvinist stage. A strong tendency toward Russification was reported by Stalin, with rare regard for truth, at the Twelfth Congress of the Bolshevik Party (April 1923). He indicated that the entire "Soviet" society, the State and the Party itself was infected with Russian nationalism. At that time Trotsky, who really imagined that he was a "Russian revolutionist" paid no particular attention to this anti-internationalist virus, nor did Zinoviev and Kamenev, also Jewish "Russians." Stalin stated: "There is growing, not by the day but by the hour, the great-power chauvinism, the crassest nationalism which is striving to wipe out everything not Russian, to gather all threads of administration around the Russian principle, and crush the non-Russian." He hinted at signs of anti-Semitism in USSR.

By historical development, every country in Christendom, owing to the anti-Semitic root of the Christian religion, must become anti-Semitic when the rulers adopt a course of extreme nationalism. Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Radek, Joffe, and the rest of the Jewish "Russian revolutionists," under Stalin's hounding, quickly awakened to the fact they were Jews. Trotsky, in Mexico, recalled: "Since 1925 and above all since 1926, anti-Semitic demagogic, well camouflaged, unattackable, goes hand in hand with symbolic trials against avowed pogromists. . . . Stalin's attitude toward this growing anti-Semitism was one of friendly neutrality." (Stalin, 399)

Quite logically, the first to be eliminated from power were Jews. It was a gradual process, begun with the frame-up of Trotsky in the Autumn of 1923, followed by the frame-up of Zinoviev and Kamenev in 1925, continuing over the years, and culminating with the dismissal of Maxim Litvinov, Commissar for Foreign Affairs, to clear the way for the Hitler-Stalin "friendly" understanding in 1939. Following Stalin's death, and after the removal of Khrushchev, the Georgians and the Ukrainians were ousted from the mountain peak of power and reduced to puppets in their home countries, Georgia and the Ukraine. Today the USSR is ruled by Russians, to the exclusion of members of other nationalities within its

borders; the other "Marxist-Leninist" States follow this chauvinist pattern. The traitors to Socialism, either courting or supporting this or that "Marxist-Leninist" dictator, pretend not to see anti-Semitism in Russia, in Poland, or the exclusion of Negroes from the ruling circle in Cuba.

Vitally concerned in leading the working class out of the fog of deception and myths, in guarding the masses against conscious traitors, against falling under the influence of the Guevara type, against the high-speed politically ignorant youngsters like Cohn-Bendit, the true internationalists, upon the establishment of a Socialist State in any country, must invite revolutionary workers from outside to participate with the native workers in keeping the administration on an even internationalist keel. It is difficult to think of a more effective tactic to start building into the mind of humanity the need to elevate the intellect to the level of species consciousness, an absolute requirement for saving the species from the nuclear conflict among the national States, which is now in the last phases of preparations.

In the *Communist Manifesto* Marx and Engels penned this thesis: "The Communist Revolution is the most radical rupture with traditional property relations; no wonder that its development involves the most radical rupture with traditional ideas."

As I have said elsewhere, I take from Marx and Engels, as well as from Lenin and Trotsky, Plekhanov, and other thinkers that ever shaped the ideology of the working class, only those concepts which have been demonstrated correct by history, and categorically reject and oppose their ideas proved erroneous and dangerous to the workers. The general linking of abolition of traditional property relations and the break with traditional ideas is a serious error. Private ownership of economy can be abolished, and still society will retain and keep in circulation most of the traditional ideas—if the new scheme of social relations is not completely cleansed of exploitative features. One of the numerous "traditional ideas" crowding the routine of "Soviet" life is *nationalism*, always to be traced to exploiters of the toilers.

The so-called "Communist" States are under *nationalist*, even fanatically patriotic governments. They represent the direct antithesis to Marx's and Engels' view cited above. Despite the most radical rupture with traditional property relations, through the abolition of private economy, the governments of these States, chiefly USSR, securing the interests of the national bureaucracy, have borrowed over the decades, page after page, from the book of ideas of the bourgeoisie and of the earlier exploiting classes. Thus, the bureaucracy has republished, without a word of critical antidote, all the Tsarist masters whose writings are filled with Great-Russian chauvinist sentiments, with anti-Turkish, anti-Polish, anti-German, anti-Tartar, anti-Jewish, and similar venoms. It is extremely difficult for a national State to counteract the deeprooted national prejudices. United States school history is anti-British, and no degree of cooperation of Washington with London can eradicate the anti-British slant of national psychology. Under a national State, the masses and the upper echelons of the Japanese society will remain victims of a gnawing hatred for the Americans. Hungarians, from a national viewpoint, can never forget the invasion by Nicholas I of Russia in 1849, the German oppression, the butchery by Nikita Khrushchev in 1956. The Czechoslovaks, as such, detest the Russians.

But when all countries are fused into one, when the international representation for administering the world State is drawn from all nationalities, when the arrangement of ideology precludes production of any chauvinist art and literature, and supplies devastating exposure of national "pride" of Russians, Americans, French, Germans, a "pride" which brings a flush of shame to certain people, then the Irish will deposit into the museum of evolution of human species the painful memory of the eight hundred years of oppression by the British, the Jews and the Arabs will be at home whether in Tel Aviv or in Cairo, and the Negroes will discover that they are not really black, and the whites will realize they are not really white, and that all human beings belong to one species.

### The Traitors Clearing the Path for Military Dictators and Nuclear War

People say, We are living in an Atomic Age. This is a wrong name for the present era. The human race is in the throes of the era of nuclear weapons. Since Hiroshima, the military budgets of all States stagger imagination. The entire hiring process is more and more attuned to the production of arms, to military perspectives in all fields of exploration, including space. To a mind which has disentangled itself from "Marxist-Leninist" and Capitalist "peace" deceptions, it is almost blindly obvious that unless the era of nuclear weapons is liquidated, and soon, by general disarmament, humanity will not live to see the beginning of the next century.

The only social class that can perform the task of saving the species is the one on whose shoulders rests the entire pyramid of oppression, the hired slaves. Only authentic Socialism can save the species. Is it necessary to make a thousand extended exploratory trips into the historical deposits of documentary evidence to demonstrate that the people presiding over this class are conscious traitors to Socialism, and therefore, are aiding the uppermost masters of both slave camps, who are moved by the exploiters' unquenchable passion for expansion of power, to drag the human race toward perdition? Is it not logical to assume that a full-scale conflict among the rival national states cannot be postponed indefinitely? And is it not clear that the policy of national security pursued by every exploitative State in the age of nuclear weapons, increases with each passing year the insecurity of the species?

In the two worlds of secret plots, of deceit, of treachery, of imprisonment for trumped up offenses, of legal police brutalities, with every political party inside the Capitalist class, from the extreme Right to its Left Liberal fringe, devoted to Capitalism, with every political organization inside the working class betraying it either to the bourgeoisie or to the "Marxist-Leninist" bureaucrats, the dispersed and isolated from one another internationalists ought to search not for a ready-made organization but for the correct revolutionary ideas. It is a must for each one of them to obtain the broadest possible clarity and the knowledge of details of every major betrayal of the working class—the minor betrayals are too numerous to be recorded in the main book of the history of treason. The name of every notorious traitor should be in the mind of the revolutionists, and inscribed on the board of infamy. What leader of the working class, for personal and national reasons, betrayed the Paris Commune to the bourgeois generals who butchered nearly a hundred thousand workers? Who maneuvered the revolutionary workers into the bloody

ultra-Leftist "Hamburg Putsch" in 1923, into the suicidal "Canton Commune" in 1927? Who were the star betrayers of the Spanish Revolution? Who? The answer "I don't know" is an immense shield for the traitors to Socialism.

A revolutionist must be on guard against such entrapping notions as the "New Left" and the "Old Left" with the implication that there lies a chasm between the two. There are no sharp delineations of epochs; they blend into each other in continuous procession. One should be able to connect all the vital links of history, ranging from the birth of the labor movement to the present day, to see the true consequences of treason inside the workers' camp, as well as the possibilities of formation of Socialism had no treason been committed.

If the mind of the revolutionists is not keyed up to the accuracy of information regarding the dreadful Stalinist abominations, which are balanced by Capitalist horrors, the recent one being the fiendish murder by the Indian Capitalists and landlords, of a million Communist workers, the working class will remain at the mercy of its misleaders. It must be made clear to the vanguard that the Capitalists, burdened with the decay of their system, could have never survived the numerous crises afflicting it were it not for the traitors within the proletariat. Politically, it is not the bourgeoisie that diverts humanity from the paths of Socialism.

Over a century ago, in 1848, in the *Manifesto*, Marx made the observation that, already then, "Society can no longer live under the bourgeoisie." Since that period, because of the traitors in the workers' camp, the bourgeoisie has not only survived, but kept expanding its industry, the sciences, armaments, its wars, culminating with its carrying the human race into the era of nuclear weapons, an impressive contribution to mass murder technique. Had Socialism been established years back, Hiroshima would never have been consumed by atomic fire, because one world State requires no war weapons, and the atomic energy, from the outset, would have been directed exclusively into useful, peaceful channels.

Cancer goes down into the grave together with its victim. The two major slave powers, if they "succeed," will destroy the human race and themselves. Concealing the extreme gravity of the present moment, these powers maintain a smoke-screen "disarmament" Conference in Geneva, sign pieces of paper, called "treaties," to lull the masses into believing that practical steps are being taken by Moscow and Washington to prevent an attack upon each other.

One of the covers for Moscow's and Washington's grim preparations for a desperate military conflict, which neither Washington nor Moscow can prevent, is the so-called "Peace Movement," largely under the Kremlin's influence. Its main guideline has been for years a damning indictment of Washington's criminal adventure in Vietnam, and absolute silence regarding Moscow's becoming the second largest merchant of arms in the world, Moscow's backing to the Indian Capitalists, through supply of arms and friendly economic and political relations in the war with the Chinese "Marxist-Leninist" dictator, Mao, Moscow's sale of guns to the Indonesian landlords and Capitalists with which they exterminated nearly a million Communist workers.

The secretly-influenced by the Brezhnev-Kosygin usurpers "Peace Movement" is of service also to Washington. The ultra-Leftist adventurous wing of the "Peace Movement," with no restrictions upon freak-

ishness, carry the Vietcong colors in the "anti-war" parades, burn the American flag, and shout for victory for Moscow's puppet Ho Chi Minh. This tactic produces a jolting impact upon the patriotic mind of all the millions who cling to the Republican and the Democratic imperialist parties. There could be no more convincing way of proving to them that the "Peace Movement" is functioning as a secret ally of the "Reds" who kill American soldiers in Vietnam. The correct policy for peace, applied by the Bolsheviks of 1917, of promoting revolutionary fraternization between the soldiers of the opposing armies, and therefore extremely dangerous to both slave powers, has been studiously avoided by the "Peace Movement." That its function is not congruous with its name was clearly defined in other than Vietnam situations. It took no note of the Indian-Pakistani War, which was settled not by the soldiers and workers of both countries, but by their oppressors at the top level, personally manipulated by Kosygin. The "Peace Movement" did not respond with the fraternization position during the prolonged Arab-Israeli tension, nor in the Six Days War, while the entire press of the Left participants in the "Peace Movement" took a pro-war stand on the side of Nasser—and Moscow.

The Capitalist directors of the United States understand that the "Peace Movement," by gravitating toward Moscow, does not augur a revolutionary development in America. Realizing that the anti-Washington noise-makers, constituting less than one half of one percent of the entire United States population, are not the Bolsheviks of 1917, but innocent and ignorant peace enthusiasts misdirected by the Gus Halls and Fred Halsteads, with some Capitalist Senators and Congressmen extending the Left hand to the "Peace Movement," while their Right hand never lets go of the rudder of the State of Wall Street Imperialism.

But Vietnam for the "Peace Movement" is merely a "port of call." What is its "port of destination"?

Since the only road to peace is fraternization among the soldiers of opposing governments, of all armies, the only possible, honest conclusion can be that the "Peace Movement" is not promoting peace. In the context of the mounting military world crisis, the "Peace Movement" is a "noise-peace" cover for the arms race, for the American-Russian traffic in war materials, for the frightening rivalry in the Mediterranean.

Only by studying the lessons of former revolutions which concealed with words their enslaving essence, can we arrive at the correct interpretation of the presence of the two mutually hostile powers in that sea.

The United States, born in revolution which stated "proclaim liberty throughout all the land, to all the inhabitants thereof," but retained chattel and hiring servitude, went over from the defensive to the offensive foreign policy, in proportion to its growing strength. The events confirming its predatory nature were, the robbing of the Indian tribes, the Mexican War, the threat by Commodore Perry to level the Japanese coastal towns with artillery if the Mikado refused to open Japan to American commerce.

The French First Republic, born in a greater revolution, proclaimed "Liberty, Fraternity, Equality," but rested on hiring servitude. Inevitably, it went over from the defensive to the offensive, sent its armies to seize Italy and other lands, conquered Belgium, Holland, Malta, Switzerland, planned to wrest the Mediterranean from the British, invaded Egypt. The defeat of the French fleet in the battle of the Nile, and Nel-

son's victory at Trafalgar put an end to the dream to invade England.

The October Revolution surpassed in depth and vastness all the previous social upheavals. The workers actually took control of Russia—but not for long. A new exploiting master emerged, the State bureaucracy, basing itself also on hiring servitude. Sooner or later, the bureaucracy, as its power grew, would go over from the desperate struggle for existence to the policy of conquest and oppression of other States. Such was the case of Stalin's war on Finland, and his seizure from Hitler of Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, East Germany and other Capitalist territories. If Napoleon, who overpowered the Feudal monarchs of Europe, if Alexander II appeared like a liberator when he abolished serfdom in Russia, then Stalin, wearing the cloak of October, certainly looked like an emancipator of the working class by overthrowing Capitalism in the domains he conquered.

After Stalin's death the bureaucracy never desisted from his course. His menial and indirect heir, Khrushchev, made an attempt to sneak into Cuba to threaten at close range American imperialism. Khrushchev's successors have a similar objective in the Middle East and in the Mediterranean. Peking, a newcomer in the nuclear weapons competition, still a fledgling but already a conqueror in mind, is increasingly confident in its ultimate ability to seize, eventually, the entire Western Pacific area and the formerly Mongolian possessions which include the fabulously rich Ural Mountains. The United States Capitalists, reverentially adhering to the duplicity of the slaveholders—founders of this bourgeois republic, having "freed" the Indians, the Negroes, the women, the masses of Latin America, of South East Asia, are living in long-range hope to "free" the masses of Czechoslovakia, Poland, and especially of China and of the USSR.

\* \* \*

The French Left bourgeois revolutionists of the Eighteenth Century not only abolished the monarchy, but, against the bloody backdrop of terrifying extermination of various social elements, including defenders of the working class and women's interests, carried the Revolution, in one respect, beyond the limit set by the Bolshevik Revolution. Momentarily, they dispelled the religious fog enveloping the population of France. They decreed an anti-religious calendar (Sept. 1793) and opened a campaign of de-Christianization not only in the teeming, advanced Paris but in the previously deeply religious countryside. The workers and peasants of France were swiftly gripped with fascination so that the revolutionary-reactionary Robespierre sensed the danger to the bourgeoisie and introduced the worship of "reason." But brief as it was, the de-Christianization struck greater terror into the hearts of the exploiters and of the Vatican and other Churches than the guillotine.

Could the de-Christianization advance into all Christendom, or at least remain intact in France? Only under one circumstance—removal of all exploiting elements. The Christian Church, the Synagogue, every other Church, is a hallmark of an exploitative society. The Church is a political instrument in the hands of the most powerful group of exploiters, which uses it in various ways, one of them as an ideological prop in war against the neighboring Christian "brethren" and non-Christian enemies. The immense slaughter of human beings in the War of 1914-1918 was carried on with the blessing of arms by the Churches of the belligerents. The

bomb sent by President Truman to burn the non-combatant population of Hiroshima had been blessed by a Christian minister.

Few historians of the October Revolution and of the ensuing Civil War are so penetratingly discerning in going over their materials as to realize that after the Bolsheviks seized power there was de-Christianization in Russia, although not decreed by the "Soviet" Government, yet vigorously operating in all institutions. From the shipwrecked political parties of the Capitalists and the landlords during the hotly controversial discussions before October, the workers, soldiers, and peasants almost overnight learned that Lenin did not "believe in God," that all the Bolsheviks were atheists, and more, and more, that almost a third of the Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party were Jews, "murderers of Jesus Christ." To the old-time hopelessly religious Russian-patriotic Tsarist "mujhik" the Jew was a curse upon Mother Russia. And suddenly his sons, and even he himself, gave support to the Jew Trotsky against Russian generals of the White Armies, support against god!

Just before the October Revolution and until the bureaucracy set up its own Church, Russia was the only consistently atheist country in the world. In 1917-1918 the Tsarist priests were conspicuously absent from private and public life. A powerful atheist movement, conducted by Emelian Yaroslavsky, a Bolshevik writer, eventually one of the most putrid Stalinist flunkies, spread like wildfire among the masses. But the "Soviet" State was emerging as an exploitative machine, and, sure enough, the renegades created a new Orthodox Church which they named the "Living Church," as opposed to the Tsarist "sincere followers of Christ."

The "Soviet" Church has become by long odds the most hypocritical of all the houses of organized superstition. It is a party to every crime of the bureaucracy. It supported Stalin's horror "Moscow Trials," his deportation of the Crimean Tartars, of the Volga German settlers, and for all these and other services the "Soviet" Church was rewarded by the renegade-dictator with State facilities, with money, with "great human understanding."

The early salubrious atheist movement in Bolshevik Russia was gradually diverted into farcical channels and finally reduced to an insignificant palpable pretense. A new generation of devotees of Christianity, not only sons and daughters of the bureaucrats but of workers and particularly of peasants, is being highly welcomed by the "Soviet" Church. The Church literature is surreptitiously printed by the State. How acceptable has Christianity become in "Socialist" Russia can be seen from the fact that Stalin's daughter, Svetlana, abandoned atheism and became a Christian.

An AP dispatch from Moscow, November 28, 1968, says: "A poll taken in the large industrial city of Gorki by Young Communist League magazine showed that 60% of the babies were baptized despite a half century of official atheism in the Soviet Union." The so-called "atheism in the Soviet Union" is of a special type. To describe it accurately, it is an ingenious device for garroting true atheism and shielding the spread of classical deception, the dignified fictitious story about a "Son of God" born of a virgin and in the most treacherous fashion betrayed by the Ancient Jews to the Roman executioners. Each Russian baby receiving the injection of this anti-Semitic poison has two parents. Can they be regarded as atheists? They are Left-Christian anti-Semites, created by

Stalin through the neat pretense at opposing religion.

In the Warsaw Pact "Socialist" countries outside the USSR, the Church is steadily gaining influence under the aegis of Brezhnev. The anti-Semitic religion is on the rise particularly in Poland. The Church there enjoys a rapidly-expanding respect rendered it by the "Marxist-Leninist" authorities. Thus, a Reuters dispatch from Warsaw is a strong testimony to this fact: "The Polish Government has sent a letter of condolence to the Roman Catholic Church on the death of a prominent bishop in an unusual gesture of courtesy." (N.Y.T., Dec. 28, 1968)

The going down the reactionary hill by the "Soviet" bureaucracy has far more ominous implications than a superficial eye can perceive. Just as Napoleon, who by abolishing the anti-religious calendar (1805) and reestablishing the spiritual power of the Catholic Church in France strengthened the Church all over the world, and laid the ground for the Holy Alliance, headed by Tsar Alexander I, the renegades of the October Revolution indirectly have helped the bourgeoisie to invigorate and fortify Christianity.

But the crux of the damage the renegades are causing by reviving the Church is the dangerous narrowing of the prospect of survival for the species. The Church, the Synagogue, and other organized disseminators of religious myths, are unitedly deadening the senses of the bulk of the human race to the threat of extermination. While rendering support to the powers which are leading humanity towards the nuclear precipice, the Churches in the Capitalist and in the "Soviet" sectors promise humanity life after death, a supernatural "Savior." They join with other chloroforming "peace" agencies of both Capitalist and "Marxist-Leninist" war houses, in making shallow, time-worn assurances of keeping watch, of possibly finding a religious escape from the dark labyrinth of deception and false hopes.

It is a verifiable fact that never since the rise of Capitalism has atheistic thought been so weak as it is today, never have the Church and science been artificially bridged together as in the present era. The fantastic pioneer trip around the moon and back to earth was a genuine joy to all who, stronger than ever before, are convinced that through application of scientific energy in adequate proportions humanity can conquer cancer and other diseases, turn its home-planet into a wholesome, glorious place for habitation, abolish war and all other social evils. *The New York Times* of December 28, 1968 wrote ruefully: "Why cannot the same kind of mobilization of resources be utilized to meet the nation's (My emphasis—G.S.) real problems here on earth? If it is possible to send men to the moon, is it not possible to give all our people (My emphasis—G.S.) decent housing, adequate schooling and proper medical care, to cleanse the nation's (My emphasis—G.S.) air and water of pollutants. . ." My reply to the editors of the supposedly science-minded newspaper would be: No, it is not possible for "our people" in this wealthiest country in the history of humanity to secure the application of science to social and individual life because reasoning and energies of the species is *nationalistic*, because "our people" is not an abstract people, but a number of human beings confined within a national boundary, divided into Capitalist hirers of labor and workers who are hired and exploited by them, into a dominant white race and a subject black race, into the subject sex and the dominant sex, into mass believers in the story that about two thousand

years ago a supernatural male of the species was born to a normal natural woman and was tortured and delivered for a frightful death by the ancestors of a segment of "our people" who believe in somewhat different myths and anti-scientific mind-clouding stories. And above all, a healthy scientific life is not possible when the energies of the nation are largely diverted to military preparation for seizing, controlling and enslaving other States under the sign of "National security." Your "adequate schooling" is designed to preserve and buttress this state of affairs, as indeed, the "education" in "Socialist" countries is tailored to sustain a very similar system, only run not by Capitalists but by State bureaucrats.

The system under which "our people" live is Capitalism. The mind of the people is not illuminated with the knowledge of the slave essence of this system because it is deliberately clouded by the ideological agents of the Capitalists with false thinking.

The tremendously magnificent achievement of circling the moon was enveloped with a superstitious cloud of belief in a supernatural male-creator of the earth and the moon, of all things, inducer of all human and lower animal actions. The journey to the moon in part, was definitely designed as a prop to the Christian Church, the old and seasoned agency of the exploiters. The scientific feat was timed to take place during the "Feast of the Nativity of Jesus Christ." The precise, preassigned splash-down for Apollo 8 in the immense Pacific was in the vicinity of Christmas Island. With the Yuletide voyage to the moon Washington pursued a triple objective: to beat Moscow in the "horse-race" whose national flag would be planted first there; to utilize the moon for military purposes in the approaching nuclear struggle for the possession of the entire earth; to strengthen belief in the nearly two-thousand-year old mythical "Prince of Peace" and "Savior" of the human race.

*The New York Times* rapturously predicted: "The praises of that odyssey will ring through the centuries." I say, not even to the end of this century—if the false ideology is not shattered and only science, not merely in technological but especially in social fields, guides the life of the species.

In the epochs preceding the advent of Capitalism the basic ingredients in the ideology of the human race, in all classes, were: general antagonism to science, darkest ignorance, illiteracy deliberately sustained by priests of all Churches, corruption of intellect of the leaders with political dishonesty and hypocrisy. In the advanced stage of Capitalism, and especially in the post-October period of history, the priests unanimously back technological, medical and other "non-political" sciences, taking credit for the development by ascribing it to a supernatural "creator," illiteracy is sharply on the decline, or disappeared altogether in the industrially advanced countries, Capitalist and "Socialist," but political dishonesty and hypocrisy have expanded and have reached the most refined stage, invisible to the average mind, as carbon monoxide, that fills the air, to the naked eye.

For good reason then the traitors to Socialism pretended that reading of passages from the *Bible* by the crew of the Apollo 8 did not cogently call for a scientific refutation of superstition. Marx in his youth, before the *Manifesto*, penned a fleeting, undeveloped, utterly inadequate statement, "religion is the opium of the people," but some of his pre-1917 studious followers presented findings to establish in concrete terms the

pro-slavery role *organized superstition* plays in social evolution. But the profound conflict between the two as falsely presented by the crew of the Apollo 8—the irrepressible struggle which has been going on in the human brain, which is the citadel of highest thinking, between theism and atheism, in a word, between superstition and science, is reaching the final stage. If science is victorious in all its social ramifications, humanity will overcome the present crisis and will live on, perhaps millions of years; if *organized superstition* maintains its hold on the mind of the species, the days of the existence of *Homo sapiens* will soon be numbered.

The traitors to Socialism, wearing a mask of "atheism," sustain, as do the Capitalists, *organized superstition*, and are therefore an active element of doom.

Ideology, the correct state of mind of the toiling masses, not the skirmishes with the police, will decide the fate of the species. The chief slogan against the traitors and the Capitalists in the military domain is: fraternization of the soldiers of all nations; the main watchword in the area of conflict between science and superstition is: the savior of the human race can be no other than the human race itself. People who, while carrying out a scientific operation, wrap it in the cloak of religion, as did the astronauts of Apollo 8, unwittingly support the would-be destroyers of the species, therefore, of all scientific achievements, and, ironically, of religion as well.

### Bright Stars in the Darkest Night

The bourgeois press seldom misses stumbling on powerful emotional twitches in "Soviet" life. The chief pursuit of the Moscow correspondents of the Capitalist newspapers is not so much to supply information to their readers back home but to imprint into the readers' mind the picture of oppression and horrors of "Communism" and also show that certain features of Capitalism are being integrated in the economic and social "Soviet" relationships. And not a few of these pictures and reports, often verified years hence by the Kremlin bureaucrats themselves, are really heart-breaking to sincere but politically uninformed supporters of Moscow.

A special dispatch from Moscow to *The New York Times*, permitted to pass by Brezhnev's censors possibly for diplomatic reasons, tells of an episode at the funeral of an old Bolshevik. The man was not one of the cool, Stalin-trained lackeys of the bureaucracy who knows no law but the command of a cynical and corrupt high official. Challenged by terrible injustices to the workers, in his doubts and anguish, and desperately unhappy, he paid a heavy price for his convictions. Stalin sent him to pass a living death in a bureaucratic prison where the man suffered seventeen years, and would have stayed on to his physical death, if Stalin had not died first.

Alexei Kosterin, 72 at his death, joined the Bolshevik Party in 1916. At that time the Party worked illegally, most of its members were in the Tsar's prisons, a few abroad. On the Capitalist battlefields the blood of the masses flowed in rivers; hunger, pestilence, disease spread in towns and villages of Europe; and no end to the horrors was in sight. Virtually all the Socialist, Anarchist and trade union leaders of the working class turned traitor. One had to possess a stubborn inner strength to maintain loyalty to the ideal of Socialism. In that seemingly hopeless

situation, in February 1915, Lenin's periodical, which he was issuing in Switzerland, carried a courageous slogan: "The darker the night, the brighter the stars."

How many old Bolsheviks were in the Party? The 1922 census of the Party membership shows that of 386,313 members only 10,431 had joined the organization in 1916 or before.

At the funeral of the old Bolshevik, among the mourners, was Pyotr G. Grigorenko, a former Major General, and a close friend of the deceased (N.Y.T., Nov. 15, 1968). Almost miraculously this man too survived a whole series of persecutions and hounding. Understandably, his feeling toward Stalin was that of extreme aversion. When he discovered, under Khrushchev, revelatory ominous signs of return to the cult of personality, he felt constrained to voice objection. Khrushchev ordered his dismissal from the post of lecturer at a military academy, and for his recalcitrance imprisoned Grigorenko for several months, without a trial. But the little "Stalin"-in-the-making, Khrushchev, thought the punishment must fit the "crime" with greater precision. So he applied the more than a century-old method used by Tsar Nicholas I to crush political prisoners, and removed Grigorenko to a prison for the criminally insane.

Expelled from the Army, from the Party, and although wounded twice during the Nazi invasion, deprived of a pension, Grigorenko, now a heavy laborer in his declining age, attempted to speak over his friend's coffin. Around the mourners were Brezhnev's police spies. The funeral was supervised by his menials who obviously had received instructions to interfere with the tributes to the dead friend. "Before and during the brief ceremony, attendants had angrily impressed upon the mourners that they wanted no long rites. Twice General Grigorenko was interrupted in his 10-minute speech by urgings over the public address system that his time was up. He looked up angrily, and speeded his delivery as much as he could while struggling to keep his voice under control."

The bureaucrats expedited the burial of a critic. Chopin's "Funeral March" a tradition with the Russian revolutionists, was intoned on the organ, but "Its strains were soon broken by a woman in a black smock who hastened to nail the lid onto the coffin. . . . The lights were turned off to speed the mourners out."

What could Grigorenko say in a few broken minutes allowed him by the attendants and the police spies? And how few of the two hundred and forty million of the oppressed people of the USSR could hear him in this tragic hour!

But what he said was enough to make the mourners weep with bitter tears, not only for the loss of the old Bolshevik, Alexei Kosterin, but, consciously or not, for the lot of the "Soviet" workers, of the workers of Czechoslovakia, Poland and others deceived, bewildered and oppressed by the Kremlin bureaucracy. Grigorenko mentioned many nameless victims subjected by the usurper Brezhnev to hard labor tortures in prisons and camps. Formally he spoke to his dead old friend:

"In farewells, it is usually said, 'Sleep quietly, Dear Comrade! We shall not say this . . . it is impossible for me without you, Alyoshka. You sit inside me, and you will stay there. Without you, I do not live. Therefore, do not sleep, Alyoshka! Fight, Alyoshka! Burn all the abominable meanness with which they want to keep turning eternally that damned machine against which you fought all your life. We, your friends, will not be far behind you."

But even before, the deep sorrow of the old Bolshevik's friends was cruelly interrupted at the morgue of the hospital where his body had lain. They were ordered to leave. "Quickly the mourners gathered up the wreaths they had brought. 'For his struggle against Stalinism,' said the ribbon on a wreath. 'From his comrades in the prisons and camps,' said another."

Many years ago, in the Tsarist era, a poet, looking about at the world of misery and hopelessness, wrote, "Woe to those awakening during an interminable night; it is not given them to shut their eyes. Fleeting dreams, carefree dreams, are seen but once." "Alyoshka" was one of those rare individuals in a society shackled by terror, drugged into incredible vigorous submission to a tyrant, individuals, men and women, who, shaken out of the deep sleep, recognized that their life-mission was to struggle against tyranny.

Black is the current night of slavery, of militarism, of deceit, hanging over the human species. And if in 1915, into Lenin's editorial room in Switzerland out of the night of the monstrous military butchery shone many bright stars in hope for struggle against Capitalism, then in the present night, created by the Capitalists and their new rivals in exploitation, the "Marxist-Leninist" bureaucrats, only a few bright stars penetrate to us out of the current dark sky. One of them is the simple but meaningful oration delivered by Grigorenko in homage to the old Bolshevik who had joined Lenin during that other night. And when Grigorenko said "Fight Alyoshka!" he addressed all the sincere people, whoever they are, calling upon them, upon us, of whose existence he does not even suspect, not to shut our eyes and go back to our silly dreams that Stalin was building Socialism in Russia, not to fold our arms, but to "Fight Alyoshka!" to shake the workers and Left intellectuals out of the Capitalist and traitors' manufactured stupor, to carry on the struggle until the ideal of Socialism, which sustained the Old Bolshevik for seventeen terrible years in Stalin's prison, which represented all that he had spiritually left under Khrushchev, then under Brezhnev, which he hoped, as we do, finds its belated fulfillment.

"Alyoshka" will live not only in the lacerated hearts of the mourners at his coffin, but in the pained consciousness and memory of true revolutionists.

Incontestably, because Grigorenko realized that had he named Brezhnev and other bureaucrats of the ruling circle as the heads of the "damned machine" the mourners would have been instantly seized and charged with treason. Caution was necessary and correct. Incontestably, too, Grigorenko knew that he was in a tiger's den, that the rulers were Stalinists, and that he was a doomed man. He was consciously sacrificing his life for flinging a few true, biting, fighting words against the enslaving, bloodsucking, shameless bureaucratic oppressors. Anybody familiar with Stalin's methods of punishment, and Grigorenko knew them well, could not doubt that the vigilant spies present at the funeral would give a detailed report to the usurpers in the Kremlin. Thus far Brezhnev had been pursuing the tactic of reducing him to penury, forcing the old man to do heavy labor and live in gloomy realization that most people around him feared to be seen in his company. But moments of tolerance are dreadfully scarce, and under Brezhnev as they were under Stalin. A usurper's vindictiveness may go far beyond this "mild" treatment. No one who

lived through the horror inflicted on the Trotskyites and other people, even on loyal Stalinists, can entirely forget the savagery of bureaucratic ingenuity in torture. They were deprived of jobs, their families evicted into the streets, and there, in snowdrifts, left to die of cold and starvation.

What punishment will Brezhnev and his gang mete out to the unassuming and courageous man? That Grigorenko could not be tempted with a gaudy military tunic, with the sight of lovely caviar, fine wines, delicious smells of roasts and pastries, and of course with more that would come his way, they knew. He was prepared to die at their hands, but would continue in the spirit of his dead friend. Grigorenko mentioned Kosterin's feelings toward the ruling bureaucrats:

"He hated not only them but also the order they had created. He tirelessly repeated Lenin's words, 'There is nothing harsher and more soulless than a bureaucratic machine.' Therefore he believed that a Communist had no higher task than to destroy this machine."

For every word Grigorenko uttered here he must have paid with great emotional pain regarding the mental captivity of the working class. He knew that abroad millions upon millions sincere but duped revolutionary workers firmly attached their hearts to Brezhnev, as they had to Stalin. He knew that the Russian masses in the grainfields and factories silently bent their necks under the bureaucratic yoke—in contrast to the strikes against the bureaucracy in 1923 or the openly anti-Stalin strikes in 1928 demanding the return of Trotsky from exile in Central Asia.

Grigorenko knew, as did Brezhnev's spies, that all the statements the recently imprisoned writers made in Brezhnev's "court of justice" were pale by comparison with what he said at the bier of the old Bolshevik Kosterin. His words thundered indictment of the thieves of power. "Fight Alyoshka!" he said, thereby openly saying he would unrelentingly struggle to destroy their machine of oppression and slavery, openly declaring that a *Communist*—meaning not a bureaucratic flunkey but a person dedicated to the ideal of Socialism—has no higher duty than to establish freedom and true democracy. Figuratively speaking to the dead friend, but actually to the mourners, and in a historical sense, to all the oppressed, he said "Freedom will come! Democracy will come!"

In 1917 Grigorenko was ten years of age, the springtime, impressionable period of life, especially during a gigantic revolution. Lenin's raging struggle against the bureaucratic machine of the Capitalists and landlords evidently impressed itself indelibly on the boy's mind. And now, fifty years later, when Grigorenko spoke of the coming of democracy, and invoked Lenin, he did not mean the establishment of the hypocritical democracy of Capitalism, which, as in France, cooperates with the most reactionary elements in bourgeois society, or as in America, where the Negro masses are harrassed politically and socially, where geographical spots of poverty exposes the lie of a "Great Society," where fabulous wealth is concentrated in the hands of a few multi-billionaires, whose Government aids and abets the Fascist hangman of the Spanish people, where in private life, an eminent democratic lady marries a Greek Fascist billionaire, supporter of a military clique in power.

No, when Grigorenko said "Democracy will come" he clearly meant the democracy of the kind Lenin spoke in 1917, the workers' democracy in a Socialist States, a position abandoned after the October Revolution

by Lenin, Trotsky and the rest of the Bolshevik leaders.

The words "Freedom will come!" "Democracy will come" had never been fired at the cruel dictators and despots-bureaucrats, since the bureaucratic order had been established. Courageous expression of sympathy for prisoners had never been witnessed in this system, at the early signs of which Lenin said, "Things have developed differently than expected by Marx and Engels" (Speech at the Third Congress of the Soviets), and should have said, than the Bolsheviks and the toiling masses expected in 1917.

Grigorenko spoke at the time when the cruel neo-Stalinist tiger has been already several years on the prowl, and not only in the USSR. It has now sunk its sharp, Socialist-painted fangs into the heart of the workers and intellectuals of Czechoslovakia, and is a terrible threat to the masses of other countries, no less than the military butchers serving Capitalism.

To naive non-Stalinist people, to people who have never paid close attention the phrase "cruel tiger" will appear an emotional exaggeration; to a duped Stalinist worker, it will sound like an outrageous, FBI-inspired, Redbaiting attack on "Soviet Russia." Yet Brezhnev's inhumanity can be likened to Stalin's, to Hitler's, to President Johnson's in Vietnam. Here is a "mild" example of Brezhnev's cruelty. Yuli M. Daniel, a writer, is imprisoned by Brezhnev in a hard-labor camp. A dispatch from Moscow lifts a corner of the curtain of long silence about him: "According to a recent report, Mrs. Daniel was allowed to visit her husband with their young son at the Ozernove camp in the Mordvinian Autonomous Socialist Republic, east of here. They covered the ten mile stretch between the railroad station and the Camp on foot, carrying as much food and supplies for Mr. Daniel as they could. At the camp, according to the report, they were forced to leave all but four oranges and a package of cigarettes outside and were made to carry the rest back home after a visit that lasted one hour. Mrs. Daniel described her husband as ill, overworked and underfed." (N.Y.T., Nov. 16, 1967)

The Tsarist prison guards were wretched amateurs compared with the refined tormentors cultivated by Brezhnev.

A year after that ordeal, Larisa Daniel was sentenced to four years imprisonment for disapproving Brezhnev's military intrusion into Czechoslovakia (N.Y.T., Nov. 20, 1968). What has been the fate of the Daniel boy deprived of both parents, the fate of the children whose fathers and mothers, having failed to grasp that the gathering dusk presaged the return of the dark Stalinist night, spoke a few words of disapproval of certain policies of the usurpers, and for that are slowly dying in the hard-labor camps, I don't know.

Millions of Communist Party members in France and Italy, tens of thousands in England, Belgium, Sweden, and other European countries, millions in Asia, Africa and South America, thousands in the United States, Mexico and Canada, disapprove Brezhnev's policy of military occupation of Czechoslovakia. If they were citizens of the USSR, they would all be "living" now in his prisons and hard-labor camps—"ill, overworked and underfed."

How many political prisoners are there in USSR? When Stalin ruled they were in the millions, and virtually all on trumped up accusations. And today? Only now and then an indication appears in some documents

smuggled out of the USSR and with relish of satisfaction printed in some bourgeois papers, but never even mentioned in the press of the Communist Party, of the Trotskyites, or of the Maoists. Thus, a letter by Vyacheslav Chernovil to the Ukrainian puppet of Moscow, Shelest, speaks of "arrests and secret trials that have swept across the Ukraine during the last nine months" in 1965-66. In an article by Chernovil there are indications of Stalin's methods of wringing "confessions" from prisoners being applied by Brezhnev: "However, even those from whom repentance had been forced after long months refused to admit at the trials that they had read 'forbidden' books or articles to 'undermine or weaken the Soviet order.' To charge a person with reading a book or article without taking an interest in his convictions and intent is a fact unheard of. . ." (Printed in *The New York Times*, Feb. 9, 1968)

By now, the population of the USSR, having barely drawn a breath of relief from Stalin's decades-old blood-congealing tyranny, is again racked with the tortures of repression. There must be thousands upon thousands of anti-bureaucratic workers and intellectuals languishing in the prisons, in hard-labor camps of this, formerly servile creature of Stalin, later a hypocritical "friend" of Khrushchev's, the current supreme jailer, Leonid Brezhnev.

From the Ancient times to the present era, the opening chapters in the bulky tome of despotism have been interspersed with records of sporadic convulsions of desperate resistance to absolute authority. The severity of oppression would either ignite a social upheaval, as under the Tsar, or result in absolute submission of the victims to the tyrant, as under Stalin. One of the dramatic signs of resistance to Brezhnev's oppression was the defiant voice of sympathy for his imprisoned victims when the mourners at Kosterin's funeral, led by Grigorenko, placed a wreath at the coffin with the inscription "From his comrades in the prisons and camps."

Grigorenko's spirit is the spirit of a martyr. Kosterin died; Grigorenko will follow him in death. But their spirit of passionate conviction that oppression must be boldly attacked and utterly destroyed, the spirit of loyalty to the ideal of recasting society, to bring release to the prisoners of tyranny, and freedom to the enslaved, will live as long as slavery plagues the human species. "Alyoshka" will fight! And there is a strong possibility, "Alyoshka" will win!

\* \* \*

In connection with the burial of the old Bolshevik, Kosterin, the *Militant* of November 29, 1968 tells something about the tragic story of the funeral, of neo-Stalinism, and subtly brings in the standard Trotskyist falsification that Trotsky fought the Stalinist development. It carries right next to the story a picture of Lenin and Trotsky, printed over the following deceptive legend:

"Lenin and Trotsky, during 1918-1921 Civil War. Lenin (on stand) warned early of danger of bureaucracy in the new Soviet State. Trotsky led battle against Stalinist bureaucratism in USSR after Lenin's death."

Lenin before the October Revolution insisted on creating a State absolutely free of bureaucratic disease. It was his declared program. After securing power, he himself abandoned this position and laid the cornerstone for the bureaucratic edifice. This fact is confirmed by documentary evidence. Later when the bureaucratic deluge swamped the State,

he spoke in condemnatory terms against bureaucratism, but took no measures to destroy it. However, in 1922-1923 he did make a strong effort to prevent the bureaucratic development going Stalin's way, planning a crackdown on Stalin. But the chief lie in the Trotskyite note is that "Trotsky led the battle against Stalinist bureaucratism in USSR after Lenin's death." As I have shown elsewhere, Trotsky, according to his own testimony took the opposite line from Lenin's: "I am against liquidating Stalin." After Lenin's death, Trotsky continued clearing the way for the Stalinist band of thieves of power. Enough to recall his monstrous crime of telling the entire revolutionary vanguard that, "Comrade Lenin has not left any 'Will,'" that the story about the "Will" was a "despicable lie." The crime in support of the Stalin gang Trotsky committed after Lenin's death. In 1927, in the *Platform of the Opposition*, Trotsky declared for "Unity of the Leninist Russian Communist Party at all costs." (My emphasis—G.S.). In short, for unity with Stalin! In the address of 121 leaders of the Opposition, Trotsky stated categorically: "We have no programmatic differences of any kind with the Party." (*Pravda*, Dec. 20, 1927)

\* \* \*

Grigorenko, without mincing words, stigmatized the so-called "Soviet" Government, as "that damned machine. . . ."

The Trotsky leaders usually describe the USSR as a "deformed workers State." They apply the same adjective to the machine headed by Tito, who operates an economic system with half State, half private ownership, to the machine operated by Mao, who has covered China with a forest of pictures of Stalin and has drenched the country with rivers of toilers' blood. But on the occasion of calling upon all these machines "to express their solidarity through concrete action" with Nasser—and Brezhnev, the Trotsky leaders "forgot" to insert the modest qualification "deformed" they usually put before the words "Workers State."

I call the social order operating in USSR, a *slave order*, because it is based on *hiring human beings*, as Capitalism. If it is in its class cell structure a workers State it is a *traitor* workers State, traitor to Socialism, to the cause of the working class—in contradistinction to the Capitalist state, which as a rule is loyal to the interests of Capitalism.

Does this appellation of the USSR seem too harsh, scientifically-speaking incorrect? Yet, didn't Lenin, when he stood solidly for the working class, appraise the Second International as a *traitor organization*? Isn't the Communist Party of France, of every other country, a *traitor organization*? Aren't the trade unions which serve the finance kings of Capitalism *traitors to the working class*?

The USSR, and all the other "deformed workers states" are loyal to the bureaucracy, enemies of Capitalism, but *traitors* to the cause of the working class, to the ideal of Socialism.

\* \* \*

Lenin, during the politically lonely years in Switzerland, amidst the carnage of the imperialist war, at that time never imagining himself becoming a State bureaucrat, remembered the anti-imperialist prisoners, not only of the Tsar but of all the oppressors of the toilers throughout the world. The correct way of thinking has been virtually liquidated by the nationalist-limited attitude of the "Marxist-Leninist" bureaucrats, who influence the so-called "New Left." Here is an example. The *Guard-*

ian, a "New Left" paper, printed a list of "imprisoned comrades" in the United States—a well-done research job. But why no mention was made of the prisoners-resisters to oppression in other countries? What about the prisoners in Spain, throughout Latin America, in military-Fascist Greece? Portugal? What about Communist workers and intellectuals imprisoned by the military-Fascist dictator Nasser? What about the prisoners in Tito's jails? In Mao's dungeons?

And what about the thousands of "Alyoshkas" in the hard-labor camps of the usurper Brezhnev? And why not raise the demand for amnesty for all the Left prisoners not only in the Capitalist countries, but also for the anti-bureaucratic, subjectively 1917-Bolshevik prisoners, the "ill, overworked and underfed" comrades of Kosterin, of Grigorenko, perishing in the slave camps of the "Soviet" bureaucracy?

And why does the entire "Marxist-Leninist" press confine the reportage of horrors of hiring slavery, of racial persecution, to the Capitalist part of the globe? Why the information about the persecution of students in the Warsaw Pact countries, about the hounding of Jews in Gomulka's Poland, appears exclusively in the pro-Capitalist publications? Simply because the pro-Capitalist sources of information, say a Liberal-Conservative organ, *The New York Times*, directed by most knowledgeable informants, hardly ever give space to exposure of the horrors of capitalism, but print quite frequently grim reports of tortures of intellectuals, of Jews in "Socialist" Russia or Poland. On the other side the *Guardian*, the *Daily World*, the *Militant* and other Left papers, record an infinite variety of Capitalist acts of injustice and brutality, but leave out any reference to similar deeds committed by the "Marxist-Leninist" dictators—except on rare occasions for the *Militant* whose editors, due to a strong practical purpose of fitting in the old canard that Trotsky from 1923 to his death fought against Stalin for "Socialist democracy," select bits of information about oppression in USSR printed in the bourgeois channels, saying, shamefacedly, "According to reports in the Western press" (*Militant*, Nov. 24, 1968).

Before me lies a copy of the *New York Times* of December 23, 1968. On page 15, I read a story about a crippled Jewish woman, Nina Karsow, whose life had been saved when at the age of 2 her mother jumped with the baby in arms from a Nazi train going to the Treblinka extermination camp. "Her mother was killed, but the injured baby was picked up by a Polish Resistance woman and saved." Nina Karsow survived undetected another three years of Nazi horrors, than a long stretch of Stalin's police dictatorship in Poland. Comulka, who followed in Stalin's tracks, filled the Polish prisons with anti-bureaucratic workers and intellectuals. Nina Karsow's body was crippled, but not her mind. It began to rebel against oppression. One of the first steps, she felt, was to appeal to the leaders of the Communist Party that they release the prisoners. They followed the normal course. "She was arrested in Poland in 1966 because the police found in her room a draft of an unfinished novel based on life in Warsaw University, a petition for the release of political prisoners and some other material deemed critical of the Communist regime."

Nina Karsow married Dr. Szechter, a blind historian, also a Jew. "Dr. Szechter brought the whole case to notice with an emotional account to correspondents that attracted world attention. He spoke after she had been convicted and sentenced to three years in prison."

By 1966, long before the Arab-Israeli June 1967 War, unofficial anti-Semitism was in full swing in Poland. The "unique" method of sustaining the power of the ruling bureaucrats, as in the "good" old Tsarist days, is police brutality. Nina Karsow was subjected to both methods of torture, as a Jew and as a possible critic of Gomulka's dictatorship: "Dr. Szechter said Miss Karsow had been the victim of anti-Semitism and police brutality . . . He said she had been physically tortured after her arrest . . . a police captain, while questioning her, had grabbed her by the throat and yelled: 'You piece of excrement . . . you lousy Jew'!"

At length, upon payment of two years of her life in Gomulka's prison as a punishment for preparing a petition for release of prisoners and for other protest ideas, and for being a Jew, Nina Karsow was rescued by the British pacifist and humanitarian Left Liberal, Bertrand Russel, who "sent a cable to Wladislaw Gomulka, the Polish Communist party leader, urging Miss Karsow's release."

Gomulka was satisfied with the amount of tortures he inflicted on Nina Karsow, so he let the "lousy Jew" and her husband, also a "lousy Jew," out of the country. They were brought to Capitalist England. And here was being played another act of her virtually interminable tragedy. Hypocritical bourgeoisie democracy, run in England by the seasoned agency of British imperialism, the Labor Party, refused her bid for asylum! "A spokesman for the Home Office, explaining the decision against Miss Karsow, said she was not legally entitled to remain here because this was not her first or only possible place of political refuge. She went from Poland to Austria and could live there or in Israel."

I have no doubt that the editors of all the "Marxist-Leninist" papers, pen in hand to make notes from the crowded accounts of daily events in the bourgeois world reflected in the reports of bourgeois correspondents, did not overlook the dispatch "Britain Rejects Polish Refugee's Bid for Asylum." Supposedly imbued with a strong allegiance to the principle of rectitude and just dealing among human beings, which is really at the bottom of the struggle against exploitation and oppression, the "Marxist-Leninist" bureaucrats generally follow the Stalinist police justice. What is that? It is a pretense at protest against Capitalist injustice but concealment of the "Marxist-Leninist" violations of codes of simple humane behavior. In the case of Nina Karsow, protection for Gomulka was infinitely of greater import to the bureaucrats than exposure of the inhumanity of the Labor lackeys of British Capitalism. So they all remained silent about Nina Karsow, including the Trotskyites who could not logically bring into her case the hoary deceit about the Trotsky-Stalin relationship.

On the other hand, Capitalist crimes against the workers, against the Negroes, the Jews, in which Gomulka's or Brezhnev's crimes are not involved, are searched out by the "Marxist-Leninist" editors and vigorously denounced in pretended indignation.

\* \* \*

With the betrayal of the French toiling masses, the terrible international tension between the two exploiting systems, with the steadily approaching major conflicts in the Middle East, in the Far East, and no sign of fraternization to prevent them, the increasing military taxation, growth of the sphere of military dictatorship, "population explosion" in the Capitalist and in the traitors' prisons! the ominous strengthening of

the ideological power of organized superstition, of anti-Semitism, in both camps of oppressors, the vicelike hold upon the mind of the advanced workers and Left intellectuals by the traitors, and upon the backward masses in the bourgeois countries by the Capitalist politicians, no darker night has ever hung over the human race, in a sense, not even in the Dark Ages when extinction of the species was not threatened by the enslavers. And on the other hand, emphasizing the incredible shrinkage of light, never were there so few "bright stars" in political firmament as in this epoch. Among the great souls was Jan Palach, a Czech student, and others after him, who through supreme sacrifice of turning themselves into human torches protested Brezhnev's tyranny in Czechoslovakia, with an implied denunciation of his despotism over the Russian masses themselves. But deeply moving as Palach's tragic self-immolation was, this method of struggle can be no more effective than the similar acts of martyrdom by the young Buddhist men and women in Vietnam protesting the United States oppression in that country. Callous exploiters and oppressor, the Capitalist imperialists and the top "Marxist-Leninist" bureaucrats, cannot be persuaded to stop being what they are. Due critical attention must be paid to the erroneous political thinking that guided Jan Palach in giving up his life. A chorus of tearfully grieving demagogues, bourgeois-democratic, Fascist, Social Democratic and Trotskyite are feigning a sense of identity with him. But let us broaden our horizon of thinking. Let us dig into our memory, not miles but only a few inches. The British leader of bourgeois democracy at Munich agreed to hand over Czechoslovakia to Hitler; Stalin and the French bourgeoisie, having made a pact to protect Czechoslovakia, did not lift a finger, even by an aerial demonstration, to adhere to the pact. Stalin, having concluded the partition of Poland with Hitler, gave the Nazis every chance to subdue Czechoslovak resistance; Roosevelt and Churchill, after the fall of Hitler, turned Czechoslovakia over to Stalin.

The Trotsky leaders sent a few ignorant youngsters to demonstrate at the headquarters of Brezhnev's Mission to the United Nations. These sincere boys and girls, thus far, show little promise of learning that without Trotsky there would have been no Stalinist monstrosity, no Hitler, no Brezhnev, and no suicides to protest Russian military enslavement of the Czechoslovak masses.

The name of Jan Palach is honored and will be remembered by revolutionists as an example of deep devotion to the ideal of freedom, as a human being radiating an extraordinary moral force whose goal is diametrically opposite from and opposed to the low passions for wealth and personal power. Unfortunately, the young Czech martyrs killed by Brezhnev and those who killed themselves did not understand the core of the task they were facing—patient and persistent exposure of the Dubceks and Slobodas as agents of the Brezhnev usurpers and traitors, to fight despair, to be internationalists, and begin building a movement for authentic Socialism.

Vadim Delone, who told Brezhnev's "court of justice" he had felt free for three minutes when he had openly protested the military intrusion into Czechoslovakia, and for those three minutes gladly accepted the three years' prison-torture of spirit and body. Pyotr Grigorenko, Larisa Daniel, and thousands of others tormented by the brutal jailers and hangmen who had served Stalin, were recently employed by Khrush-

chev, and now carry out the orders of Brezhnev—the uncorrupted, defiant, fervently dedicated to the ideal of freedom of intellect, to the ideal of liberation from all oppression and slavery, dared, in one way or another, to indict the "damned machine." They are buoyed from sinking into the sea of despondency by an overwhelming conviction that the vast blackness of lies and hypocrisy and brutal force will give place to the dawn of truth, of emancipation of all the enslaved and oppressed, physically and intellectually, that the heavy doors of the Capitalist and of the traitors' prisons will be shattered by the sledge-hammer of the Socialist Revolution, that as long as the human race lives, the beacon by which to search out the correct path to Socialism will never be extinguished, that Socialism, the unification of the human race under one international State, is as attainable a goal as the reaching of the moon, that the sacrifices of the martyrs in Czechoslovakia and elsewhere will not have been in vain, in short, to repeat, that "Alyoshka" will win.

### **The Trotskyites and the Sellout of the Jewish-Arab Masses**

And how do the present-day Trotskyist leaders, who continue painting an appealing image of a mythical "Socialist democracy" during the Lenin-Trotsky regime, stand in relation to the Kosterin thesis regarding the duty of every Communist to destroy the horrible bureaucratic machine IN USSR? One can judge by their acceptance of the fraud by the usurper Brezhnev, that the military-Fascist dictator of Egypt, Nasser, and the other Arab oppressors and enslavers, some chattel slave owners, represent "The Arab Revolution Against Imperialism," that the machine which acts as a veritable brain-crusher and body-breaker of the unfortunate masses within its power is, by implication, a *liberating force*. The true anti-war position of fraternization of soldiers of opposing armies does not exist for the Trotsky leaders, as it does not exist for the whole pro-Stalinist "Peace Movement" with which they are connected. However, the Trotsky leaders "criticize" the Brezhnev-Kosygin thesis. They condemn "the passive attitude of the USSR . . . in the Middle East" (*Militant*, July 10, 1967). In a word, don't just stand there and do nothing, while Nasser is fighting for the "Arab Revolution"! The Trotskyites call upon all bureaucratic "Socialist" machines to enter the Arab-Israeli War on Nasser's side: "It is the duty of the workers States to express their solidarity through *concrete action* and not by empty phrases. . ." (My emphasis—G.S.)

In evaluating the present Trotskyist position, serious investigators must first deal with the question, What is Israel, and for what purposes did the Christian imperialists, secretly all atheists of course, and Stalin, supposedly fighting religion, create a virtually clerical State for the nation which "killed Our Lord, Jesus Christ"?

The answer rests in the historical role of the Jews as the classical scapegoat for the ruling exploiters, particularly those of Christendom, and today also of the "Socialist" part of the world.

Who really introduced the idea of partitioning Palestine and planted the seed of unprecedented hatred between the Arabs and the Jews? The answer is supplied by "Soviet sources:

"During the discussion of the Palestine Question in the Security Council of the United Nations, the Delegation of the Soviet Union proposed to liquidate the British Mandate over Palestine and create in

Palestine a bi-national Arab-Jewish State; but if this will not be possible (in view of the artificial sharpening by the imperialists of antagonism between the Arabs and the Jews) to divide Palestine into two independent States, Arab and Jewish. The latter proposal was accepted by the General Assembly of the U.N." (*Bolshaiia Sovetskaya Encyclopedia*, XVII, 515)

Stalin and his American-French-British "allies" understood that after the Hitler nightmare of destruction of six million Jews, the remaining Jews in the world, particularly the Socialist-minded Jewish workers and intellectuals, would seek a true solution to the Jewish Question. The "solution" the Capitalists and the Stalinists decided upon was to cause the Jewish intellectuals, the Jewish Capitalists, Jewish scientists (Einstein) and last but not least, the Jewish proletarian vanguard to turn their hearts, their minds, and a part of their income to the Zionist adventurers to build a "home" for the Jews, capitalists and workers, in the Arabian hornets' nest. In that manner the Jews once more were marked to perform the historical role of a scapegoat, first by diverting attention of the proletarian vanguard from the Socialist solution to the Jewish Question, and finally, as in many previous scapegoat situations, to be massacred by the Arab tools of the Moscow and the Washington rulers.

In 1947 Stalin's machine was up to its neck in clearing the debris left by Hitler's devastation and Stalin's "scorched earth" policy, and rebuilding the ruined towns and villages. Outside the borders of USSR, in the States occupied by his Red Army, Stalin was mobilizing his Communist Parties to remove the Capitalists from the economy and to transfer the administrative mechanism into the hands of the henchmen. The thought of entering the Middle East and the conquest of the Mediterranean was as remote from his mind and from the mind of the old and the new generation of young Stalinist bureaucrats, Brezhnev among the latter, as the notion to send his airmen to the moon. He did not supply a single gun either to Israel or to its Arab enemies. In that political setting, the Trotskyites, in pursuit of their "revolutionary" masquerade, penned a position on the crisis in the Middle East along correct lines. On January 1, 1947, almost a year before the partition of Palestine was put into effect, they warned the Jewish population:

"British imperialism and the Arab feudal lords and the bourgeoisie will for their part do all they can to turn the hatred of the oppressed Arab masses against the Jews as a scapegoat. Thus the Jews in Palestine are in danger of being wiped out in the widespread explosion which is preparing in the Middle East." ("Draft Theses on the Jewish Question Today" *Fourth International*, Jan.-Feb. 1948, p. 18)

This uniformity of the Trotskyist appeal to the victims of Zionism and of the Arab anti-Semitic pogromists was followed up in the Arab-Israel war:

"Jewish workers! Get rid of the Zionist provocateurs who tell you to sacrifice yourself (sic) on the altar of the Hebrew State.

Arab workers and fellah! Get rid of the chauvinist provocateurs who are getting you into a mess of blood for their own sake and pocket. Workers of the two peoples, unite in a common front against imperialism and its agents!" (*Fourth Int.*, May 1948, 88)

Recalling the words of Rosa Luxemburg during the 1914 War, the

Trotskyites wrote, "In this spirit we say to the Jewish and Arab workers: The enemy is in your own camp." (Ib.)

Today the Kremlin machine, headed by the usurper Brezhnev, is playing a notable role in sustaining and expanding the military structure of the Arab Capitalists and landlords. The Trotsky leadership, for all the stirring and egging on the "Soviet" bureaucracy to join the Arab rulers in military action against Israel, is sufficiently trained politically to grasp that "the rising Arab revolution" (*Militant*, Jan. 17, 1969) is clearly not a workers and fellahin movement against the Arab Capitalists and landlords, not even a chattel slave movement against the sheiks of Saudi Arabia with whom Nasser is on friendly terms. If it were, the Moscow bureaucrats would have instantly denounced it—and the Trotskyites know this.

The highest level of human thinking is not nationalism, or racism, but *species consciousness*. The Trotskyites cite the ideology of the "rising Arab consciousness" (Ibid.). The so-called "Arab revolution," therefore, represents a *nationalist* upsurge, just like Zionism, or "America first"ism. On that low level of human thinking the workers of all countries, in all periods of history, are chained to their national enslavers in peace and in war.

Lenin, long before the emergence of the Stalinist plague, spoke about "War for the liberation of humanity from hiring slavery." ("Letter to American Workers" Aug. 1918). Isn't the Middle East part of humanity? Is the war between the Eshkols and the Nasses a struggle for freeing the toilers from hiring slavery, or for the continuation of that form of exploitation of human labor? The Trotskyites are silent on that question. Is this war at least for the abolition of chattel slavery in Saudi Arabia and Feudal oppression of fellahin peasants? The Trotskyites are silent. Is it for freeing the wretched Arab female from her lot of a slave to the male? The Trotskyites are silent. No doubt if the Zionists win another round, the war in the Middle East will intermittently continue. But what will be the fate of the Jewish masses—also of all the Jews in the Arab countries—if the "Arab revolution," armed by the "damned machine" in Moscow and instructed in war-techniques by Brezhnev's highly trained Suvorovite officers, secure a definitive victory? And what would be the fate of the toiling masses in Egypt and other Arab countries if not a deepening of their enslavement?

The so-called "Arab revolution," "Arab militants," "Arab resistance movements," "Pan-Arabic movement"—terms used in profusion by the Trotskyites—are backed to the hilt by Brezhnev's "damned machine." If nothing else, the Moscow Stalinist endorsement of organized Arab nationalism is quite an adequate factor by which to conclude that the movement is ultra-reactionary. There is not a sign in the Middle East to indicate that the "Arab revolution" is even for a bourgeois revolution to carry out land reforms, which would reduce the landlords' oppression over the fellahin. The Trotskyites speak "of the progressive nature of this nationalism." (*Militant*, Jan. 17, 1969). They, just as the bureaucracy of the USSR, picture the Arab States fighting for national independence. When and where did the Moscow "Marxist-Leninist" bureaucrats ever back true independence for any country either inside the USSR, or outside? In Hungary? In Poland? Perhaps in Czechoslovakia?

Al Fatah, one of the strongest pan-Arabic formations, combining

extreme nationalism and a warm feeling of gratitude for Nasser's benefactors and friends, the leaders of the USSR, a group that cries for blood vengeance, is pictured by the Trotsky leadership as becoming *internationalist* in outlook, representing the birth of the movement for authentic Socialist Revolution: "Al Fatah is becoming more and more internationalist. . . . Most importantly, the organization of a pan-Arab movement, independent of the existing capitalist regimes (but linked to the Arab exploiters and their governments—G.S.), signals the beginning of the revolutionary Socialist movement which is needed in the Middle East to direct the struggle against Zionism and imperialism into the necessary Socialist channels. . . ." (*Militant*, January 17, 1969). Why not also against Arab Capitalism, Arab Feudalism and Arab chattel slavery?

As a matter of fact, the Arab workers and intellectuals that might have moved into the trans-national area of political thinking have been kept by Nasser in prison since 1959, the year when the "damned machine" of Moscow drew substantially upon its resources to expand his military power. The "Soviet" publications bear testimony to Nasser's persecution of those duped honest people *loyal to Moscow*, and even to Nasser, but, subjectively for Socialism. "In 1959-60 an anti-Communist campaign was carried out throughout the land (arrest of hundreds of Egyptian and Syrian Communists and persecution of democrats)." (*Sovetskaya Istoricheskaya Encyclopedia*, 1967, X, 449)

By vividly bunching together extreme chauvinism with internationalism, by bridging neo-Stalinism with the idea of authentic Socialist revolution through the means of racy "revolutionary" writing, the Trotskyite leadership provides a clear insight into the despicable dishonesty of the engineers of this matchless tangle. If this concoction were true, wouldn't Brezhnev's ideological police crash down upon the pan-Arab movement as an enemy of the "Soviet people"? Wouldn't Nasser, with other Arab rulers, ostracise and destroy this "beginning of the revolutionary socialist movement," kill or imprison its members?

But the real reason why Brezhnev is aiding the Arab enslavers and their pan-Arabic organizations is being concealed by the Trotskyites, as by all other "Marxist-Leninist" tendencies. In a certain aspect the Moscow bureaucracy is closely following the pattern in foreign policy of the American Revolution, which was a movement for independence of the chattel slaveholders and Capitalists in the English American colonies, and of the French revolution, which was an anti-royalist upheaval that put the bourgeoisie of France in power. The leaders of these Revolutions made a turn from desperate defensive strategy to the vigorous offensive against their outside enemies. The USSR is in the bureaucratic power-expansion stage. In the recent decades the United States imperialists have established a considerable economic influence in the Arabic oil countries, and have established their undisputed control of the Mediterranean. The Kremlin machine, emerging as a challenger to the industrial, military and naval power of American imperialism, seeks a firm foothold in the Arab countries by capitalizing on the resentment of their rulers at the formation of the Zionist State, and is bent upon riding its fleet, now the second in the world, through perhaps as strong as the sea murder weapon of the United States, on the crests of the waves of the American lake in Europe, the vast Mediterranean. Only a spark is required to set the Near East ablaze, perhaps igniting a world Hiroshima.

The Arab and the Zionist rulers have for some years been in a sort of a revolving door of their virtually incessant conflict. Toward the end of 1968, after a thousand turns in that door, agents of the Arab exploiters attacked an Israeli plane in Athens. The Zionist Government followed with a piece of vandalism by destroying a large number of Lebanese civilian planes. All the powers united on condemning Israel. The Trotsky leaders thought it opportune to bring out sharply their present line of buttressing the Arab slaveholders, actually of support to the position of the Moscow machine in the Middle East: "Israeli government made clear once again its determination to use whatever brute force it deems necessary to maintain its illegal occupation of Arab territory." (*Militant*, Jan. 10, 1969)

What is legal and what is illegal in the world of slavery? When Trotsky was an honest leader of the revolutionary workers he said, quite correctly, that only the toiling people are legally entitled to the possession of all the land, of the entire globe. When the peasants took over the lands of the aristocracy, was that action legal? Absolutely! Was the seizure of immense tracts of Mexican territory by the United States legal? From the nationalist point of view of President Polk and the Southern slaveholders whom he served, it was a legitimate piece of robbery. But authentic proletarian revolutionists do not raise the demand for instituting "justice" among the robbers but for liberating the workers wherever they live, be it Mexico or the United States, Israel or Egypt, regardless of which national exploitative group this or that territory belongs or ever belonged. Consistent internationalists do not subscribe to the idea of restitution of national ownership of lands to original robbers and thieves. National oppression is removed with the establishment of the international workers' State. Nationalist ideology is enslavement of the workers' mind, and is detrimental not only to the struggle for Socialism but, today, to the preservation of the life of the species.

On the basis of the exploiters' "legality" and "justice" Constantinople, the present Istanbul, should be returned by the Turks to Greece, Alexandria turned over by Nasser to the Greek rulers, Quebec to the French, most of Latin America to Spain, Brazil to Portugal, the Neva area which Peter took by force back to Sweden, Eastern Siberia and Mongolia to the Chinese "Socialist" State.

On the *nationalist* level of thinking, Gibraltar should belong not to the British Capitalists but to the Spanish Capitalists; but true internationalists say, Gibraltar, Spain and England, as well as Israel and Egypt, should become parts of the world democratic workers' State.

The brutal historical truth is, the Ancient and Medieval slaveholders, and later the United States chattel slaveholders and European and American Capitalists robbed the weaker exploiters and the world toiling masses of their lands, and now the "Marxist-Leninist" bureaucrats have joined the bourgeois thieves and robbers in the military-conquest game. There is hardly a city, especially in Europe, that was not at one time or another soaked with the blood of the workers as soldiers, and of the masters as officers. Columbus, whose memory the American bourgeoisie holds in profound respect and affection, for without him there would have been no American bourgeoisie, the moment he set foot on the land of the Western Hemisphere declared, without asking the consent of the Indians, all their land to be the property of "their Catholic Majesties"

King and Queen of Spain. The United States Government made the date of that robbery, October 12, a legal holiday. From the point of view of the interests of the *toiling masses* that seizure was *illegal*, and so is the holiday honoring his name.

Apropos, a story is told about a young peasant, just before the opening stage of the French Revolution, violating the exploiters' law by trespassing a field "legally" belonging to a nobleman. An argument ensued:

"Hey, you! You have no right to be here. This land is mine."

"Is that so! And how did it happen to be yours?"

"My great grandfather left it to me."

"And how did your great grandfather acquire it?"

"Oh, he fought for it."

"By Jove" said the peasant, removing his coat, "I'll fight for it too."

From the aspect of proletarian conscience, and the program of Socialist revolution, the Jewish Capitalists have no right to even one inch of ground in the Middle East, and neither have the Arab Capitalists and slaveholders. The land by the principle of justice belongs to the Arab and Jewish toilers. And when this correct concept enters the mind of the masses in the Middle East, they will smother national hatreds, unite against the exploiters, and will take all economy and found a segment of the world workers' State.

And since the Trotskyites venture into the realm of conformity and attachment to land property law of the exploiters, let me remind the workers and students that the "Nassers" of old took Egypt from the original inhabitants also illegally. The authentic Egyptians were not Arabs but Hamites. In the course of application of the principle of violent seizure of lands, chieftains of tribes from the Arab Peninsula descended upon Egypt, burned native villages and murdered a large part of the original population. However, in contrast to the Ancient "Dyans" who butchered, by the instruction of "Jehova," not only the inhabitants of Jericho but their cats and dogs as well, the "Nassers" enslaved the ancient people of Egypt. The present fellahin are regarded by ethnologists to be the descendants of the original Egyptians. With the Trotskyites, evidently, it matters *when* the robbery, murder and rape were committed; if long ago, these crimes are legitimate.

Mindful of the terrible danger of a nuclear conflict which may start any place, any moment, particularly in the Far and in the Middle East, the Trotsky leadership nevertheless pursues the line of inflaming the advanced workers in support of the Brezhnev-Nasser alliance, driving toward a major war. The *Militant* of January 10, 1969, carries a conspicuous heading, "The new Israeli aggression," and next to it a picture of an Arab worker with a horribly disfigured face: "1967 victim of Israeli napalm."

This stooping to the despicable strategy of nationalist hatemongering takes my memory back to the bloody days of 1914 when the leaders of Social Democracy helped the Capitalist masters to whip up a nationalist war-hysteria for the purpose of sending the slaves of Capitalism to the battlefields. Every serious observer of wars knows that in this bloody business atrocities are committed by all belligerents. The French Social Democrats stressed the German atrocities, while the German Social Democrats, in order to sound convincing to the German workers, emphasized the atrocities perpetrated by the Tsar, than an ally of France.

To come back to the idea of fraternization, the Trotskyite leaders are endeavoring to palm off a tactic of "fraternization" on the Jewish masses in Israel, *consciously* setting up a trap by inviting them to "join" the Arab terrorists whose actions are orchestrated by the Arab exploiters. While the ultra-nationalist Arab "resistance movement," saturated with strong anti-Jewish venom, is burning with impatience to cut every throat of the two-million Jewish population of Israel, the Trotskyites write: "Clearly the only hope for the Jewish population of Israel is that they turn away completely from their present government and its policies (this portion is correct—G.S.) and join with the developing Arab resistance movement." (*Militant*, Jan. 10 1969)

The editorial office of the *Militant* should be "honored" by Brezhnev and Nasser with a plaque for advising the toiling Jewish population of Israel to "unite" with its would-be exterminators.

To recapitulate: the Middle East situation involves a mingling of intrigues and conflict among bandit gangs. The Zionist adventurers despite the warning Palestinian pogroms in 1929 and 1930, have brought together two million Jews, largely of the working class, into a setting full of chauvinist passions and fury, with an Arab "Treblinka" clearly in the offing. The Moscow "damned machine," after the crashing downfall of its Arab allies in the Six-Days War, is advancing with striking determination into the Middle East and is challenging the control of the Mediterranean by United States imperialism. The policy of all the big powers is to uncoil the situation with the destruction of Israel adding to the six million Jews murdered by Hitler two million more, for whose lives the powers, as well as the Trotskyites and other "Marxist-Leninist" traitors care very little, if at all. The only hope for preventing the turning of Tel Aviv, Cairo, Beirut and other populated centers in Israel and in the Arab countries into blazing furnaces of destruction and death is the "1917" revolutionary fraternization of the Israeli and the Arab soldiers aimed at the overthrow of the Eshkols and the Nassers, and the formation of a unit, even if it be the first, of the workers' democratic world State.

### The Trotskyites and the Rise of Anti-Semitism

The Moscow machine operates in every area of political life of the human race and so do the Trotskyites and other "Marxist-Leninists." On the issue of anti-Semitism, the "Soviet" statute book writes a powerful indictment of this poison. Hiding behind the law in the USSR, as in the United States, as in Britain, or in Poland, anti-Semitism as a result of a corrupt and corrupting social system, is part of the hard core of the mentality of the Western Capitalist and "Socialist" population. Trotsky diverts the attention of his readers from the fact that the "symbolic trials against avowed pogromists" with which Stalin烟-screened his sympathetic, whispering anti-Semitism, had begun in the days long before 1925. In the three decades of Stalin's rule "Soviet" society totally assimilated anti-Semitic ideas. The Communist Party of the USSR, and particularly the youth organizations under Stalin were literally riddled with anti-Semitic events, one of them, for instance, a severe beating inflicted on a pregnant Jewish student in Kharkov. The Stalinist hooligans staged an anti-Jewish pogrom in Daghestan, laying the blame for this criminal affair on mythical "Tsarist pogromists."

After Stalin's death, temporarily, Khrushchev, during the de-Stalinization, stepped on the brake, and active anti-Semitism came to a halt, although the distribution of the anti-Semitic writings of Dostoyevsky and of other Tsarist masters of literature continued without abatement and without a single note of criticism, being inculcated into the mind of the "Soviet" population ("The Jews will drink the people's blood"—Dostoyevsky). But soon, especially after the Six Days War, the "damned machine" picked up speed and quite efficiently seasoned its sharp propaganda against the Zionists with the arsenic of anti-Semitism.

The Arab slaveholders, using identical tactic, have been pushing a shrill anti-Semitic attack on the Jews residing in Egypt, Syria, Lebanon and in the other Arab countries. The superintendents of this campaign reach out across the Atlantic where the Jewish bourgeoisie, already knocked off balance by the ill-concealed hostility of all the big Christian powers, marshals its support to Israel. The campaign of defamation of the Jews is rising in crescendo. Nasser and the other leaders of the "Arab revolution" have revived the Blood Accusation used by the Christian Feudal lords, by the Tsars and the Christian bourgeoisie, the culminating element in the Dark-Ages-hounding of the Jews. Thus, on Sunday, January 12, on Channel 5, WNEW, in the ten o'clock evening news a report was included describing the Arab anti-Semitic build-up. In a pamphlet, Arab children are shown to be "murdered by Jews" for the purpose of using their blood in the unleavened bread eaten at the Passover.

A worker or an intellectual, who attaches himself to the traitors, above all to the "damned machine" of Moscow, must go all the way where this machine will take him. Trotsky knew even without Stalin's report at the Twelfth Congress that in the Communist Party everything "non-Russian" was subjected to the pressure of the Russian principle. Trotsky records that Stalin directed the attention of the Russian workers to the Jewish composition of the membership of the Trotskyist group. And when Trotsky called for unity with Stalin, in the face of Stalin's "friendly neutrality" toward anti-Semitism, wasn't his policy to establish peace with anti-Semitism? Of course it was! Trotsky took a leaf from the book of the rabbis and the Jewish bourgeoisie. For nearly seventeen hundred years the rabbis and the wealthy Jews have been lackeys of the Christian State, constructing hypocritical "unity of Christians and Jews," in the face of the anti-Semitic story that the Jews killed the Christian man-god, thus making peace with anti-Semitism which includes the Blood Accusation.

The present-day Trotsky leaders, by supporting the "Arab revolution," are ensnaring advanced workers and intellectuals into making peace with anti-Semitism. They are thus vastly enhancing the impact of this social evil which is almost openly promoted in the "Socialist" countries, particularly in "Socialist" Poland, by the "damned machine" of Moscow, which the Trotskyite traitors to the working class pretend to fight.

#### A Brief Summary

The human race, which has always been a prisoner of false hopes, is today in mortal danger. It can be rescued out of the ideological chaos, from the traps of dishonesty and hypocrisy, and escape destruction only

by *species-conscious* vanguard of the working class. The need to clarify the honest but extremely confused members of the Left community has never been more urgent than today. The necessity to unmask and expell from the midst of the working class, of the student body, of the oppressed nationalities, all the Moscow and the Peking Stalinist and Trotskyite liars and betrayers, the Guevarist disrupters of the Socialist Revolution, the Social Democratic traitors to Socialism, the Anarchist "anti-Statists" is a matter of life or death for the species.

I wish I were in error, but there is no question in my mind that unless the vanguard, in at least one important country, is faultlessly enlightened, unless it comes to grips, simultaneously, with the traitors in the workers' camp and with the Capitalists—the repetition of carnage of revolutionary workers, as recently in Indonesia, of betrayals, as recently in France, of military seizures by the Capitalist generals, as recently in Greece and in Brazil, and by the traitors to Socialism, as recently in Czechoslovakia, of grimly lurid Washington-Moscow super-plots, as in Vietnam, of Washington-Moscow tension in Central Europe, in the Mediterranean, are unpreventable.

Again, equally unpreventable, at this moment, is the widespread, pathetic tragedy of the youth in all countries of both Capitalism and "Socialism." Hundreds of millions of boys and girls, many of Capitalist families, are given to grotesque, silly, almost bordering on derangement, notions of rebellion against oppressive shackles, of freedom to be effected through radical changes in personal attire and facial appearance, through surrender to drugs, pornography, alcohol, hooliganism, prostitution, and other decomposing evils of bourgeois and Stalinist societies. On the Right perimeter are the Fascists; on the Left there are the youth-captives of the traitors, with an amazing amount of fighting energy. The walls of their young politically undeveloped minds are painted with images of Che Guevara, Trotsky, Mao, Stalin, Brezhnev, and other misleaders of the oppressed. The lives of these youths are being cast away by the traitors in ultra-Leftist action to provide a firecracker display of glaring flashes of "revolutionary" struggle for the "liberation" of the workers and oppressed nationalities. The present-day ultra-Leftism, seemingly incidental and spontaneous, is nothing but a repetition of Stalin's "Third Period" (1928-1934). In those ultra-Leftist days the Communist workers were instigated to assault the Socialist workers as "Social-Fascists," and offer insane, picturesque defiance of Capitalist armed forces. A Stalinist worker, whose mind was impressed by the Browder-Foster stories about the "shining example of Socialism" under Stalin, in a rage, during a demonstration in Union Square, attempted to bite a cop's horse.

The traitors, while clandestinely misdirecting and dissipating the sincere emotional force of the rebel youth, achieve their purpose of unbridgeable separation of the vanguard from the backward masses, in the key countries of Capitalism, United States and England, of continuing the political chaos in the ideology of their victims. And the victims, infused with the urgency of "quick pace" conquest of power for the traitors to Socialism, are giving up their lives in do-or-die battles with the police, or years of their lives in Capitalist prisons, sincerely imagining they are sacrificing themselves for the liberation of the working class. In objective reality they struggle for the continuation of its enslavement,

for the strengthening of the grasping hands of its enemies, and, instead of for eliminating the danger of extinction inherent in rivalry of various groups of exploiters, the duped revolutionary-minded workers and intellectuals fight for the assassination of the human race by the Capitalists and the "Marxist-Leninist" bureaucrats.

The vanguard of the working class and the Left students are a political bridge to the backward masses. As long as the advanced elements continue captive of ambitious adventurers and charlatans, of conscious betrayers, of "revolutionary" noise-makers and schoolboys, and of ignorant political amateurs, the situation, indeed, will remain hopeless. I hold that either the vanguard will reach the full depth and breadth of understanding of its present ideological and organizational imprisonment, and will adopt, before the time runs out, the program of keeping the political guides of the workers away from posts of power, to prevent repetition of the tragic bureaucratic degeneration of the leadership, of launching a drive for abolition of hiring servitude, for ending male domination, for the uncompromising ideological struggle against the pernicious belief in supernatural "Saviors," for unification of all races and nationalities under the roof of one truly democratic, workers' global State—in sum, either that, or the ideal of Socialism, indeed, the very life on this planet, will disappear in the mushroom-like clouds of smoke of exploding nuclear bombs.

GEORGE SPIRO  
Box 143 Cooper Station  
New York, N.Y. 10003

January 1969

**Books by George Spiro**

**MARXISM AND THE BOLSHEVIK STATE**

(over a thousand pages) \$6.50

**MARXIST-CAPITALIST THREAT TO DESTROY THE HUMAN RACE**

(over a thousand pages) \$6.50

**Order from:**  
**George Spiro**  
**Box 143 Cooper Station**  
**New York, N.Y. 10003**